

MODERN PHILOLOGY

VOLUME XXXI

August 1933

NUMBER 1

GEOFFREY AND KING ARTHUR IN *NORMANNICUS DRACO*

I

STEPHEN of Rouen is known to some as a monk in the great abbey of Bec. He may perhaps have entered it about 1143, was a deacon, was of noble family, was nephew to Bernard (from 1134-35 to 1149 abbot of Mont St. Michel), and died some time after March, 1170.¹

In spite of this slim biography, he is a person rather clearly defined through his writings. His chief intellectual interest was in rhetoric,² displayed by his work on Cicero, Seneca, Quintilian, and Martianus Capella, and by his own poetic style from first to last; the wealth of the Bec library in rhetoricians proves rhetoric, next to theology, one of the chief interests there, and Stephen did not originate. So far as known he wrote nothing in the vernacular. His minor poems, largely occasional, are fatiguing if read all at a sitting, but not one at a time, and have no more bad virtuosity than many rondeaux and triolets.

¹ T. D. Hardy, *Descr. Catal. of Materials* ("Rolls Series" [1862-71]), II, 297-308; Paulin Paris in *Hist. litt. de la France*, XII (1869), 675-77; Charles Fierville, in *Bulletin de la Soc. des Antiq. de Normandie*, VIII (1876), 54-78, 421-42, 499-501; Richard Howlett, *Chronicles of Stephen, etc.* ("Rolls Series" [1884-89]), II, xii ff.; M. Manitius, *Gesch. d. lat. Lit. d. Mittelalters* (Munich, 1911-31), III, 690-94. His works are published (except most of the prose) in H. Omont, *Le Dragon normand et autres poèmes d'Etienne de Rouen* ("Soc. de l'hist. de Norm." [Rouen, 1884]); and the *Draco* and some of the minor poems in Howlett (above), pp. 589-779, from which the *Draco* is here cited.

² "Caetera vana michi videntur, sola sophia
Dum placet efficit cetera vana michi.

Si desint verba, quid praevalat ulla sophya?"

—OMONT [pp. 223, 231]

Critics who canonized classical poetry in the manner of some generations ago have been too severe on him. But he had no power. His poems show little reading in classical poetry, and not a vast deal in later literature, and are mostly in the medieval manner, some purely metrical, more of them rhymed; not very incorrect in verse, not very wordy, often telling in style, but without architectural grasp, with little to say, and without a spark of poetry; *tours de force* often, full of mannerisms and mechanisms, skilful in the microscopic sort of rhetoric. He was a proud and honest lover of poetic style of a rather trivial kind; as he says contentedly:

Vix reor invenies genus amodo versificandi
Ignotum nobis, vix reor invenies.³

He is not especially devout; a conformist, satisfied, refined, good-tempered and very clever; sociable, full of friendships and admirations. He uses his literary training and skill to exchange ingenious letters with friends, express his genuine admiration for the great, and uphold various correct views. Perhaps it is harsh to call him a snob, for there is every reason to expect him to sympathize with the Norman and ecclesiastical ruling caste; but in spite of the rhetorical custom of fulsome praise he is more obsequious than most. On the whole he is a picture of a rather commonplace monk of the better sort.

His principal work is the *Normannicus Draco*, extant in a single fifteenth-century manuscript in the Vatican: nearly forty-four hundred lines in metrical elegiac distichs, written between 1167 and 1169.⁴ It has lost at least two passages, of about a hundred verses each.⁵ His authorship of the poem, though anonymous, has been accepted for over a century by all who have gone into the matter, and completely proved by Fierville and Howlett. It is founded largely on William of

³ *Ibid.*, p. 223. Mr. Howlett censured him for writing poems in such echoing "epanaleptic" distichs as the foregoing; but Ovid and Martial wrote such distichs, and Venantius Fortunatus whole poems of them. Is it possible that Stephen was more cultivated than some of his critics?

⁴ The chief discussions of the *Draco*, besides those mentioned in n. 1 above, all brief, are by L. Delisle in *Bibl. de l'Ecole des Chartes*, XXXVII (1876), 501-4; Kate Norgate, *Engl. under the Angevin Kings* (London, 1887), II, 57-58; R. H. Fletcher, *Arthurian Material in the Chronicles* ("Harvard Studies and Notes in Philology and Literature," Vol. X [Boston, 1906]), pp. 145-46; E. K. Chambers, *Arthur of Britain* (London, 1927), pp. 110-12. Apparently it was unknown to Miss Lucy Paton, *Fairy Mythol. of Arth. Rom.* ("Radcliffe Coll. Monogr." [1903], No. 13), and has been hardly more than glanced at by Arthurian students.

⁵ After I, 1494, and II, 780. Some of the incoherence might be explained by other losses; e.g., after I, 482.

Jumièges and Robert of Torigni, but the fact that at Bec he was near and known to important personages makes it a recognized authority for the last sixteen years treated. It has exactly the traits seen in his other works: much good rhetoric, some bad, and little poetry. The lack of order, proportion, and coherence is worse in so long a poem, but it is better in having more to say, and in being freer from lyric mannerisms. It begins with the chief recent event in Henry II's family, the death of his mother, and is betrayed there into too much narrative background; but save for interruptions on ecclesiastical and early French history proceeds with some method through the history of Normandy, France, and England from the Norse invasions to the last moment. Few medievals understood the more subtle unity of the ancient poets, and unless (like Dante and Gower) they adopted the regimentation of the scholastics were likely to drift; but the poem does not deserve the severity of one or two critics who seem to have merely glanced it over. The proem shows he wrote in a light and cheerful mood, with his usual devotion to style, and with the purpose of glorifying Henry II, which he does throughout.

The poem is saturated with the *Historia regum Britanniae* of Geoffrey of Monmouth, who is named as Monemutensis, its authority on King Arthur (II, 1178). Hence comes the title *Normannicus Draco*. There is no allusion to this within the poem, but both the *incipit* and the *explicit* as well as the proem have the title *Normannicus Draco*; the editor has taken liberties with nothing more than its order of words and his heading for the whole.⁶ His notion of it he gives succinctly—"The word *Draco* here of course means *standard*," and this statement is repeated by Charles Gross. It is entirely mistaken. It is true that an image of a dragon was used by many peoples, especially the English, as a military ensign,⁷ but its appropriateness here would be dubious. The words, in Stephen's order, are imitated from the precise part of the Prophecies of Merlin which he borrowed so much from all through—"exurget Germanicus Uermis," "coronabitur Germanicus Uermis," "vix obtinebit cauernas suas Germanicus Draco."⁸ These

⁶ Pp. 585, xciii ff. In 1739 Bernard de Montfaucon described it as "Anonymi Normannicus Draco." See also Omont's edition. There is no doubt that this is the proper title.

⁷ See *Speculum*, VIII, 223 ff. All the evidence shows the Norman dukes did not use it except through their office as English king.

⁸ *Hist. reg. Brit.*, VII, 3, early (I use Griseom's text all through).

expressions mean the Saxons. *Normannicus Draco* is merely a taking phrase for the Normans, whose ruling house is the chief subject of the poem. The fact that no interpretation of the title is given in the poem probably shows that Stephen assumed his readers' familiarity with the Prophecies.

From the middle part of the *Historia* there are other reminiscences. Its account of Hengistus' conversation with Vortegirinus is felt as a precedent for Rollo's with Dux Raynaldus; as the one is asked of his religion and declares "Deos patrios, Saturnum, Iouem, atque ceteros qui mundum istum gubernant colimus; maxime autem Mercurium" (VI, 10), so the other, asked if he worships Christ, answers:

Christum nescimus, patriis diis thurificamus,
Atque Creatori, qui sua cuncta regit [I, 921 f.]

This last line shows a natural kindness for the Normans.

The title is only one of many passages remembered from the earlier parts of the Prophecies of Merlin, the allegory in which would appeal to a man who had excerpted Haimo of Halberstadt on the allegory of Isaiah.⁹ He adopts identifications of their animal symbols with personages not only of times before Geoffrey wrote but of later days. King Arthur is the boar of Cornwall, as in the Prophecies.¹⁰ Henry I is constantly the lion:

Comparat hunc vates rugienti jure leoni;
"Succedet leo iusticie, ad cuius rugitum Gallicane turres . . . tremebunt."¹¹

The imperial marriage of his daughter Matilda and the drowning of his children are related in the words of the Prophecies;¹² and so is the dismembering of his dead body.¹³ As to the accession of Stephen,

Huncque suosque novos natos horumque favorem
Sublimem fieri vatis in arte vides;
"fauor nouorum sullimabitur."¹⁴

⁹ Omont, pp. 171-72. Jerome, and Haimo of Halberstadt, on Isaiah were in the Bec library in the twelfth century (see Becker, cited p. 7 below, pp. 199 and 262; *Patrol. Lat.*, XXIV, and CXVI, 715 ff.).

¹⁰ II, 1086, 1155; *HRB*, VII, 3, early.

¹¹ I, 239; VII, 3 middle. Also *N. Dr.*, I, 1652; II, 3, 15; III, 52; John of Salisbury, *Polier.*, VI, 18, etc.

¹² I, 172, 233, 1654 f.; VII, 3 middle ("Catuli . . . nidificabit").

¹³ I, 243; II, 23-24; VII, 3 middle (lacking in some Geoffrey MSS, and probably a later addition; this would point to 1135 as the latest possible date for the writing of the Prophecies).

¹⁴ I, 249 f.; VII, 3 middle (apparently of Henry's new heirs); John of Salisbury, VI, 18 (with other bits of the Prophecies).

So far the poet's interpretation is Geoffrey's; but now we find imagery, which is either obscure or was meant for early events, affixed to events of the later twelfth century. At the accession of Henry II,

Montibus instat aper, galeati transvolat umbram,

Merlinus merulae vocibus ista canit;

"Apri igitur dentibus accinctus, cacumina moncium et umbram galeati transcendet."¹⁵

Stephen's favorite passage in the Prophecies is "the eagle of the broken covenant and her third nesting," which had been meant of Matilda and her marriage to Geoffrey of Anjou in 1128, after the emperor's death and her return to Henry I's household in 1125. This he, like others, applies to Henry II's marriage to Eleanor of Aquitaine in 1152, after the annulment of her first marriage.¹⁶ Henry II (like his grandfather) and his sons are also called the lion and its cubs.¹⁷ The prophet is usually called *vates*, but twice *Merlinus*, and *pièces justificatives* from his Prophecies follow the poem in the manuscript and did so in other copies.¹⁸ He is praised to the skies, and compared to David and Isaias.¹⁹ However it may be with Arthur, Merlin's prophecies are taken very seriously indeed, as they were by better men than Stephen, though not by all. Medievals, especially monks, liked the titillation of not disbelieving in marvels, and prophecy was the one respectable miracle outside religion.²⁰

II

If the Prophecies of Merlin supply the chief element of picturesque mystery in this matter-of-fact poem, Arthur supplies the chief imaginative element, though not for an imaginative purpose, in an abrupt

¹⁵ I, 359 f.; VII, 3 middle (refers to Stephen's campaign toward the north in 1154 according to the commentary by Alain de Lille; the real intention is obscure).

¹⁶ I, 297, 395; II, 116; III, 1319 (in I, 395, applied to Matilda's children). The passage is applied again to Eleanor by Ralph Niger, who died ca. 1210 (*Chronica*, "Caxton Soc." [1851], pp. 95, 98; and cf. p. 166). Just so Walter Map (*De nugis*, IV, 1) applies to the young Henry, son of Henry II, Geoffrey's passage on the Lynx (VII, 3); Matthew Paris applies this to Henry III (*Chron. maj.*, "Rolls Ser.," I, 208, etc.), and Roger of Hoveden and Benedict of Peterborough the Lion's cubs to Henry II's sons (Roger, "R. S.," II, 47; Benedict, "R. S.," I, 42).

¹⁷ Probably because, as contemporaries said, he had a lionlike look. I, 308, 371, 421, 435, etc.; II, 424, 925-35; III, 52; many of the foregoing borrowings are noted by Howlett.

¹⁸ I, 360, 1645-46 heading; early gloss on p. 712; pp. xciv f.; *Bibl. de l'Ec. des Ch.*, XXXVII, 501-3. The chapter headings in *Draco* are clearly by the author.

¹⁹ I, 1656-67.

²⁰ Stephen makes much of celestial portents (III, 153 ff.).

and surprising episode. This is the most spirited, amusing, and well-written part of the poem, and is the subject of the rest of this article. It is slightly prepared for, in a way showing that the Bretons' notion of their Arthur as still alive was familiar to the Norman author; when Rollo in the ninth century burned the Breton Nantes, we are told Arthur did not know what was going on, and so did not help.¹ This Norman gibe shows that to Stephen's readers there would be less abruptness than to us in the later episode. This is an extraordinary correspondence between Arthur and Henry II.² Attacked by the latter, Rollandus, a leader of the Bretons, writes an appeal to the immortal Arthur as his lord, who promises that Henry shall desist through warning or force, and makes best speed to save them. His long letter to Henry is crammed with obvious allusions to the *Historia*. To pass over certain ones listed by the editor, the grim beginning, "Arturus Henrico , quod meruisse putat" (II, 969 f.), recalls the Roman defiance—"Lucius Arturo , quae meruit" (IX, 15). Arthur retails his campaign against Lucius, whose eastern allies he mentions (1011 ff.), and alludes to the Jugurthine origin of some of their names;³ he recalls his own northern allies, and their march to Autun (1043 ff.; IX, 19, X, 4). In his great battle,

Claudiocestrensis consul, dux agminis hujus,
Collibus elapsus, fulminis instar adest [1097 f.];

so "consul Claudiocestrie cum legione quam esse infra colles superius dixi subito cursu occurrit" (X, 11).

Separat Arturus sociorum corpora caesa,
Sarcophagis donat per sacra deinde loca [1121 f.];

so "Arturus corpora procerum suorum separari iubet," and royally buries them in abbeys (X, 12). *Aper Cornubiae*, he is now reconditioning his legions in Cornwall,⁴ a vantage-point for dealing with Henry (1213 f.). All this suffices; Stephen knew Geoffrey's ninth and tenth books as well as he did parts of the seventh.

The changes he makes in Geoffrey's narrative are a trifle startling.

¹ "Arturus nescit ista geri" (I, 660).

² II, 941-1282.

³ 1027; *HRB*, X, 1; *Speculum*, VI, 211.

⁴ Probably that in Britain, the scene of his begetting and his end in Geoffrey; but Cornouailles in southwest Brittany is so called in Latin (Robt. of Torigni, *Chron. Steph.*, "Rolls Ser.," IV, 237, 267).

Instead of being king of insular Britain by birth, and merely suzerain over the king of Brittany, Arthur had conquered both *Britones*, *Anglos*, and *Franco*s (981 f.); his army was part English, but the Britons are his special people. The insular Britons to this writer are *Walia* (1045), and *Britones* means *Bretons* as it would to any Norman. We must see reflected here the vogue of Arthur's name and fame in Brittany; and also perhaps an evasion of a difficulty—Arthur, one king of the island and of Brittany, opposing another's rule of Brittany. A further logical tangle, the poet's chief hero Henry threatened by the more renowned hero Arthur, is evaded by the sacrifice of the latter's dignity.

Geoffrey's *Historia* is far from being the only book with which we can see or suspect familiarity in this episode, even though Stephen was not very bookish. To mention some of the others will prepare for what will here follow. It is usually significant if marked parallels to a medieval work can be found in a work known to have been generally familiar. In this case we are still more fortunate. Stephen is believed to have been a monk at Bec about 1143–70. We have from his time two catalogues of the extensive Bec library, one dating from 1142–64, the other seemingly from 1154 or earlier.⁵ Many of the books, some of which there is independent reason to believe Stephen used, are named in one or both catalogues, some of them bound in one and the same volume. Catalogues are rarely complete, and he may well have used other books at Bec as well as elsewhere. But we are practically certain that he had only to walk along the cloister to find (1) "*vita Alexandri*,"⁶ (2) Geoffrey's *Historia*, including the Prophecies of Merlin (the foregoing three all in one volume), (3) Orosius, (4) Isidor's "*ethimologiarum lib. XX*," (5) "*Pomponius Mela de cosmographia*," (6) "*Macrobius de saturnalibus lib. III*," (7) "*Macrobius super somnium Scipionis*," (8) "*Plinius de naturali historia libri XXXVI*," (9) Rabanus Maurus, *De rerum naturis*. All these are in the first catalogue mentioned, and most of them in the other too. In the latter is also (10) "*Martianus Capella de nuptiis . . . lib. II et de VII arti-*

⁵ G. Becker, *Catalogi bibliothecarum antiqui* (Bonn, 1885), pp. 199–202, 257–66. The first date is fixed by means of the giver of the books (see *Chron. Steph.*, IV, 217, "Rolls Ser." [1889]), the second by the fact that it seems to have been written by Robert of Torigni while at Bec (see Faral, *Lég. Arth.*, II, 20, 47). Only the second catalogue is mentioned by the editor of the *Draco*.

⁶ Probably that by the archpriest Leo (p. 8, below).

bus . . . lib. VII."⁷ The greater classical poets are conspicuously absent from this grim fortress of theology, and Stephen's apparent indifference to them is thus accounted for.⁸ With the concentrated reading and memory of a scholarly man who had (as we should feel) few books at hand, Stephen would know well such of the books as bore specially on his chief work, those on history and allied subjects. Further, much of their contents would be in the air at Bec, discussed by its monks in such time as they could spare from theology and gossip.

III

The *Draco* shows much general knowledge of some of the most widespread of light and recreative Latin reading in the Middle Ages, one of the three chief medieval versions of the Alexander story, probably that by Leo.¹ I mention their lightness as congenial to Stephen and to his use of them. They have far less historical verisimilitude and serious dignity than Geoffrey's *Historia*; compared with it they have a curiously relaxed and smiling air, not unlike the genial tone of the *Draco* episode. I call them light and recreative also because works with much of the fantastic and much of domestic human feeling, with no tendency and with so little moralizing and connection with deep issues, must have had chiefly that sort of appeal. The vernacular versions drawn from them, beginning with the Alberic of Besançon fragment, import

⁷ Becker, pp. 200 and 264, 261, 201, 202, 265-66. Under (9) I give the more correct name for the encyclopedia usually called *De universis*. Hereafter if a work cited was in the Bec library I shall mention the fact. In the same volume as the *De nuptiis* was the ninth-century commentary on it by Remigius of Auxerre, still I believe unedited and perhaps containing things bearing on the *Draco*. Other works catalogued which Stephen is known to have used are William of Jumièges' *Historiae Northmannorum* (in both: Becker, pp. 200, 264; *Chron. Steph.*, II, xviii f., 625, 631), and others.

⁸ Classical works are all practical, rhetorical, scientific, historical, moral, philosophical; the only ancient poet is Claudian. In spite of the interest in rhetoric, it is hard to see why Howlett (p. xvii) and Manitius (p. 8) should mark out Bec, especially in view of such inmates as Lanfranc, Anselm, and Ivo of Chartres, for secular learning and humanistic tendencies.

¹ Julius Valerius, *Res gestae Alexandri*, ed. B. Kuebler (Leipzig, 1888, Teubner ed.; references below are to this), also ed. by A. Mai (Milan, 1817), and in Mai's *Classici auctores* Vol. VII (Rome, 1835); its *Epitome*, ed. J. Zacher (Halle, 1867); the archpriest Leo's so-called *Historia de Preliis*, ed. as *Der Alexanderroman des Archipresbyters Leo* by F. Pfister ("Samml. mittellat. Texte," No. 6 [Heidelberg, 1913]). See also F. P. Magoun, jr., *Alexander of Macedon* (Harvard University Press, 1929). Since the Leo version was far the commonest and most influential in the Middle Ages (Pfister, pp. 38, 41), and contains a curious parallel to the *Draco* not found in the others (p. 10 below), we should conclude that Howlett (pp. xxiv., 698, etc.) and Manitius (pp. 692-93) were mistaken, and that Stephen's source, and the "vita Alexandri" bound up with Geoffrey's *Historia* in the Bec library, was not that of Julius Valerius but Leo's.

an edifying tone lacking in the originals;² a good example of the amiably Philistine spirit of earlier vernacular literature compared with the sophistication of that in Latin. At any rate, whether Geoffrey in portraying Arthur thought a little or not at all of the career of Alexander, Stephen thought of it much; and in a peculiar spirit, which we shall see may have been rather forced on him.

To begin with, much of the matter, even narrative, in the Alexander books is in numerous letters between Alexander and his mother and Aristotle, Darius, Porus, and others. These are at least as likely as the one short defiant letter of Lucius Hiberius to Arthur in Geoffrey's *Historia* (IX, 15) to have suggested the curious form of the *Draco* episode. Further, there are in the *Draco* various vague or very forgetful references to incidents in Alexander's career. These are his defiance of Darius;³ his interview with the talking trees;⁴ the night prowling of lions and other beasts about a pool;⁵ apparently Alexander's visit to Darius in the disguise of a messenger;⁶ Darius' death.⁷ The allusions are mostly so very inexact that clearly Stephen made them lightly and indifferently. The wars of Alexander as well as a mind on geography (see later) may have suggested the Parthians, Indians, and Arabs (1195-96).⁸ The surprising domestic touch, that Arthur should foretell, and Henry allow, a delay in his campaign against the Bretons owing to his mother's death, echoes the emotional and family tone of the other works, especially the sentimental regard of Alexander and Darius for their mothers.⁹ What is more, Stephen's

² Cf. Paul Meyer, *Alex. le Grand* (Paris, 1886), II, 69 f.; Gaston Paris, *Litt. franç. au M.A.* (Paris, 1890), p. 75.

³ Leo, I, 23, 38; Valerius, I, 16, 38 ff.; *Epit.*, I, 23; II, 14. Cf. *Draco*, II, 971 ff.; evidently the Bretons had accused Henry of attacking them too suddenly. Stephen assuredly is not rebuking Henry through Arthur's mouth, as Howlett suggested (p. lxxix); warning is not required for attacking rebels, and Stephen would never criticize Henry. Just so Arthur, but not Stephen, ridicules Henry's recent French war (1188-90). Some of the parallels to Valerius are pointed out by Howlett.

⁴ Valerius, III, 24-27 (*Draco*, II, 991-92). It is not in the *Epitome* or the oldest texts of Leo, but is in various later recensions of the latter; see Pfister, *Kleine Texte zum Alexanderroman* (Heidelberg, 1910), pp. 33-35.

⁵ Leo, III, 17; Valerius, III, 18-19; cf. *Draco*, II, 1111.

⁶ Leo, II, 13-15 (cf. III, 19-22, perhaps another recollection); Valerius, II, 20; *Epit.*, II, 14-15. Cf. *Draco*, II, 1219 ff.

⁷ Leo, II, 20; Valerius, II, 33; *Epit.*, II, 20. Cf. *Draco*, II, 1234, 1243.

⁸ Who figure repeatedly in the foregoing works. The Parthians were also a contemporary touch, meaning the Turks, very much of a live issue during the crusades (*Speculum*, VI, 219, and add Wace's *Brut*, 11372, and Walter Map, *De nugis*, II, 18 ["Parthis, id est Turchis"]).

⁹ Leo, many places from I, 41 to III, 32; Valerius, many from I, 14 to III, 49; *Epit.*, many from I, 22 to II, 20.

sentimentalism is closely paralleled in a passage in Leo alone (I, 41); Alexander writes Darius that he will defer his war against him because his own mother is ill. There is no indication that Henry really delayed, still less for such a reason. Matilda's last illness was somewhat prolonged, near Rouen, which Henry visited in August. She died there September 10. When he heard the news he is said to have already subdued "all the Bretons," even in the west, and was still stopping in Brittany, and we next hear of him in October near Cherbourg,¹⁰ both of them several days' journey from Rouen; he would not seem to have sped to his mother's funeral. Stephen's explanation might be gratifying to Henry as a son, and as a second Alexander, but one suspects it pleased chiefly the trivial Stephen.

But now come points more significant and amusing. While the braggart Arthur compares himself to Caesar,¹¹ Ninus,¹² Nebuchadnezzar, Constantine, Charlemagne, Rollo, William the Conqueror,¹³ Achilles,¹⁴ Samson,¹⁵ he compares himself oftener to Alexander.¹⁶ Are we to believe him? Oh, no! Alexander, though less of a conscious model than in the vernacular versions, cuts an attractive figure in Leo and Valerius, and for a semi-oriental potentate is notably unassuming. It is the letters of Darius which show the grandiloquence of an oriental despot.¹⁷ Alexander's mockery of that of Darius and other enemies is more like the jovial fearless mockery of Arthur's grandiloquence by Henry than Cadur's of the Romans' in the *Historia* is (IX, 15).¹⁸ To Arthur's comparison of himself to Alexander Henry at once replies among his friends that with his arrogance and savagery Arthur resembles not Alexander but Darius, ordering Alexander to return home, laughed at by Alexander's princes;¹⁹ and all through it is Stephen's hero Henry, and not Arthur, who resembles Alexander. Some learned men were annoyed by seeing Arthur suddenly in the

¹⁰ Rob. of Torigni, p. 232; Henry's *itinerarium* in L. F. Salzmann, *Henry II*, pp. 244-45; *DNB* (art. "Matilda"). Stephen himself carried the bad news to Henry (Howlett, p. 708; and cf. Sec. VII below); and he clearly implies Henry was not at the funeral (*Draco*, III, 81-84, 105 ff.).

¹¹ II, 977, 993-94, 1169.

¹² II, 987-88; due to Orosius, *Hist. adv. paganos*, I, 4 (at Bec); cf. Poem XVIII, ll. 12-13 (Omont, p. 234).

¹³ II, 989-90, 995-1000, 1133.

¹⁴ 1040 (not St. Samson, as Howlett says).

¹⁵ II, 1199 f.

¹⁶ 977, 991, 1111, 1169.

¹⁷ Leo, I, 36, 39, 40; II, 10; Valerius, I, 37; II, 25; *Epit.*, I, 36, 39, 40.

¹⁸ Leo, I, 37, III, 26; Valerius, I, 38; *Epit.*, I, 37-38, 46. Cf. *Draco*, II, 1218, 1230.

¹⁹ 1219 ff., 1226, 1230, 1235-38, 1243-44, 1247-48, and cf. 1225 with 963.

twelfth century pushed into prominence among the world's heroes; many will remember how nettled William of Newburgh was because Geoffrey "profecto minimum digitum sui Arturi grossiorem facit dorso Alexandri Magni." Perhaps educated Bretons had themselves made the comparison, and led Stephen to his retort. Stephen was evidently one of these irritated foreigners, but his retort is cleverer than William's. It is his Arthur himself who puffs himself four times as Alexander's equal or superior; and it is to Darius that Stephen's hero Henry smilingly compares him in the domestic circle, for his tall talk and possibly disastrous end.²⁰ We need not deny Stephen the wit to see that the best way to expose a pretender is to let him expose himself. Stephen would seem to have read *vitam Alexandri* and *historiam Britonum* in one and the same volume in the Bec library, but he used the one not only to embellish the other but to ridicule its hero.

IV

But I am mistaken if Arthur's dignity and seriousness are not undermined in subtler ways; subtler at least in making more demand on moderns for the grasping, though probably equally apparent to sophisticated readers in the twelfth century—able monks, a few cultivated seculars and laymen, the highly educated King Henry. The immortal Arthur, having been healed in the holy isle of Avallon, is living among the Antipodes, a word which means the inhabitants of some other side of the earth, and is used many times.¹ He has received the rule over them, governs the *hemispherium inferius, inferior mundus*, half the world;

Evolat ad superos, quandoque recurrit ad ima.²

Our author is even at pains, overstraining his geography, to make his readers realize what this means; speeding to the help of the Bretons from Antipodes-land, through the Cyclades, Arthur has had to fight his way through the Indians and Parthians on the plains of Arabia.³

²⁰ 1235 f., 1243 f.

¹ "Arturum . . . qui tunc apud antipodes degebat"; "apud antipodes Arturus colloquium habuit"; "Traditur antipodum sibi jus"; "Antipodes hujus fatalia jura tremiscunt"; "ab antipodum . . . tellure recessi"; "Bellis antipodum pacatis"; "Antipodum sibi jura favent" (946-47 head, 954-55 head, 1165, 1171, 1193, 1207, 1241).

² 1167-68, 1172-73.

³ "Ab antipodum pro te tellure. . . . Per Cycladas veniens, . . . Indos cum Parthis, . . . In campis Arabum fudimus" (1193-96).

A full back-picture for this of Arthur among the Antipodes would be long to present, would involve a lingo of its own, and reports of speculations as to whether the earth is flat or spherical, and whether there are inhabitants in either half of a western hemisphere, or directly far south of Europe and Asia beyond the impassable tropics.⁴ Enough to say that the ancient theorizers favored Antipodes in one or more of these senses; the earlier Christian usually rejected them on theological grounds;⁵ and the medieval again were less disinclined to favor them. It is agreed by most that inhabitants at the south would be forever cut off from Christendom by the equatorial heat, and those (far seldomer suggested) to the west by the impassable ocean. Obviously the first and third groups of writers are best for illustrating Stephen. It is clear, too, with all his vagueness, that what he is thinking of is a southern hemisphere and an indefinite land beyond Asia. In putting Arthur in the lower hemisphere, half the world, Stephen shows that his knowledge is well past the darker ages, and agrees with the best knowledge of his own day as to a spherical earth.

Antipodes, sometimes synonymously called Antichthonēs, are accepted seriously as south of the known world in Pomponius Mela's *De chorographia*,⁶ Pliny the elder's *Naturalis historia* (VI, 22), Solinus' *Collectanea* (capp. 16 and 53), Cicero's noble *Somnium Scipionis* (cap. 6), Macrobius' commentary on it,⁷ Martianus Capella's *De nuptiis*,⁸ almost all intimately familiar in the twelfth century and all but Solinus in the Bec library. After the time of the Fathers, Rabanus Maurus in the ninth century states that the Antipodes are said *fabulose* to live in the fourth part of the world across the ocean in the south, unknown to us because of the heat.⁹ For the central Middle Ages—while belief in Antipodes was not strictly orthodox or usually accepted—under the influence of the classical writers, especially

⁴ Armand Rainaud, *Le Continent austral: hypothèses et découvertes* (Paris, 1893), esp. pp. 128 ff.; K. Miller, *Mappaemundi* (6 vols.; Stuttgart, 1895-98), very thorough but incredibly lacking any index; J. K. Wright, *Geographical Lore of the Time of the Crusades* (New York, 1925); C. R. Beazley, *Dawn of Modern Geography* (3 vols.; London, 1897-1906); G. Sarton, *Introduction to the History of Science* (Carnegie Institution of Washington, 1927), pp. 239, 249, 516.

⁵ Chiefly contradiction of scriptural implications and promises, especially as to the preaching of the gospel.

⁶ I, 1 and 9; sometimes called *De cosmographia* and *De situ orbis*.

⁷ I, 22, 13; II, 5, 22 ff.

⁸ Books VI (Teubner ed. [1866], p. 204) and VIII (p. 325).

⁹ *De rer. nat.*, XII, 4 (based on Isidor; at Bec; *Patrol. Lat.*, CXI, 353).

Martianus Capella and Macrobius, it was played with not unfavorably in a speculative spirit, as by William of Conches (early twelfth century, a Norman in the great school at Chartres), and the English Alexander Neckam (1157-1217), and even flatly accepted later by Albertus Magnus (1193-1280).¹⁰ Less responsible writers sometimes go farther than most; the *Vita Merlini*, written about 1150 and attributed to Geoffrey of Monmouth, describes the middle zone, too hot for inhabitants, as flanked by temperate zones both inhabited by men.¹¹ The passage does not name the Antipodes, and occurs in a discourse on the world's structure, a long way from the account of Arthur's isle of refuge, and is very unlikely to be Stephen's chief precedent. Still, the probabilities are that Stephen knew or knew of the *Vita Merlini*. Besides the foregoing, nowhere else before him do we find Arthur's isle of refuge a remote oceanic island, or Morgain its lady who heals Arthur; further, her ability to be at will in Brest, Chartres, or Pavia at least resembles Arthur's remarkable journey.¹² Stephen therefore is not eccentric as to the Antipodes.

We might consider medieval maps. Many dozens of *Mappaemundi* are known, and are reproduced and discussed in Konrad Miller's very thorough work of that name already mentioned. Antipodes-land does not appear in most of them, their scope being confined to the known; but it is shown as south of the known world, and as said to be inhabited by the Antipodes, in the St. Sever and Turin versions of the Beatus map (manuscripts of the eleventh and twelfth centuries) and in maps in Lambert of St. Omer's *Liber Floridus* (manuscripts of the early twelfth and late thirteenth). This encyclopedic work, written not very far from 1100, is extant in at least eight manuscripts, and was long highly valued.¹³ In this region, he says, philosophers place the Antipodes, but he asserts roundly that they are not descended from

¹⁰ The very interesting passages are in William's *De philosophia mundi*, IV, 2 and 3 (*Patrol. Lat.*, CLXXII, 85-86; formerly attributed to other writers); in Neckam's *De naturis rerum*, cap. 49 ("Rolls Ser.," No. 34, p. 160); and Albertus' *De natura locorum*, I, 7 and 12 (*Opera* [Leyden, 1651], V, 271, 277). And cf. Wright, *Geogr. Lore*, pp. 160-61, 385. According to Augustine, says Neckam, there are no Antipodes; but they may be discussed *doctrinae causa aut figmenti*, with which latter hint Stephen's doings fully harmonize.

¹¹ Ed. J. J. Parry (University of Illinois, 1925), ll. 749 ff. (ll. 792 ff. seem to put hell underneath the tropics). Cf. Honorius Augustodunensis (*Patrol. Lat.*, CLXXII, 122).

¹² *VM*, 920 ff.; L. A. Paton, *Fairy Mythology of Arth. Rom.* ("Radcliffe Coll. Monogr." [1903]), pp. 7-8.

¹³ Miller, *Mappaemundi*, I, 11 and 17, and plate at end; II, Pl. 8; III, 44-46; Beazley, II, 555, 570, 595; *Patrol. Lat.*, CLXIII, 1009, 1016, 1024-26; 1005-6, 1029 ff.

Adam; thus the classical and Christian views were reconciled. Since their land is forever unknown, no information could be expected as to the nature of the Antipodes; but in the hot regions far south next to their land, and sometimes in regions where other maps show Antipodes-land, are depicted various fantastic semihuman creatures.¹⁴ It is as such creatures, if at all, that a verdant fancy would probably picture the sons of another than Adam who might people Antipodes-land.

It may even be that in planning the episode Stephen did what any of us would do (with greater ease and profit)—consulted some map. In the Bec library were various books dealing with geography in which maps might well have been found.¹⁵ What most justifies the guess is the mention of the Cyclades, the rough circle of biggish islands in the western Aegean east of the Peloponnesus. They are very rarely mentioned by later Western writers,¹⁶ and it is true are omitted in most maps; but in several are the most striking of all features, arranged in a neat circle, exactly in the center of the world in that of Henry of Mainz (twelfth century), and close to it in the fine Hereford map (later thirteenth).¹⁷ Their name and their look were both inviting. Stephen's more commonplace regions are usually found, though hardly in a position to make Parthians and Indians likely defenders of the plains of Araby. Hearsay, reading, and perhaps a look at a map, together with plenteous indifference to even such exactness as was attainable, account for Stephen's geography.

Two rationalizing and less mysterious views of Antipodes-land, partly contradicting the foregoing, were discoverable through admired classical writers. A tendency to identify the land of the Antipodes

¹⁴ They are confused with the unknown Antipodes by some of the modern writers cited above. Placing them in India and thereabouts was due to such familiar works as Julius Valerius' *Res gestae Alexandri*, III, 51. Cf. Rabanus Maurus, *De rer. nat.*, XII, 4 (*Patrol. Lat.*, CXI, 352).

¹⁵ Especially Macrobius; cf. Rainaud, pp. 29, 137-38.

¹⁶ Never, apparently, in the chief English historians of the twelfth century; only once in such a likely place as the many voluminous Latin crusade chronicles in the five huge volumes of the *Recueil* (III, 482). Pomp. Mela, Pliny, Solinus, Martianus Capella (see their indexes), Isidor of Seville's *Etymol.* (XIV, 6, 19), and Rabanus (*De rer. nat.*, col. 356) merely explain their name as due to their circular arrangement, which accounts for them in the maps mentioned above. The Osma Beatus map (early thirteenth century) even puts some of the Aegean Islands east of Taprobane (Miller, I, 35; Wright, pp. 123, 310); an extreme example of jactant geography which parallels Stephen's vagueness.

¹⁷ Miller, *Mappaemundi*, II, Pl. 13; III, Pl. 2; IV, Pl. 00.

with that of the dead appears now and then. According to Macrobius' *Saturnalia* (I, 21, 3; at Bee), we call Proserpina "numen terrae inferioris circuli et antipodum"; and sometimes the later Greeks and Romans, according to the best of authorities, Franz Cumont,¹⁸ put the Isles of the Blest, or of the virtuous dead, among the Antipodes, an idea which vaguely survived into the Middle Ages, including, of course, Dante. This view, if in Stephen's mind, would harmonize with his shadowy and ambiguous figure of Arthur.

Secondly, Antipodes-land was sometimes identified with Taprobane or Ceylon, known to the ancients and the medievals as beyond India, and as the most remote known land toward the south and east. Its position was vague and its size vastly exaggerated; Pliny's *Naturalis historia* (VI, 22), Solinus' *Collectanea* (cap. 53), Isidor of Seville's *Etymologiae* (XIV, 6), and various writers give its length and breadth as four times the actual; it is inhabited, full of pearls and gems, and its seasons, like those of the Antipodes, differ from ours. Now Pomponius Mela's *De cosmographia* (III, 7) describes it as either a very large island, "aut prima pars Orbis alterius." His follower Pliny's *Naturalis historia* (VI, 22) goes farther—"Taprobanen alterum orbem terrarum esse, diu existimatum est, Antichthonum appellatione"; "extra orbem a natura relegata." Solinus (cap. 53) says exactly the same in other words.¹⁹ This identification would be a further ground for fancying the Antipodes to be such grotesque creatures as were placed by geographical writers in the farthest southeast.

This early identification of Taprobane with Antipodes-land is not without bearing on the charms of the isle of Avallon. In the *Vita Merlini*, after an account of various islands, ending with those marvelous and remote, including Taprobane, the seer Telgesinus describes the isle to which the wounded Arthur was conveyed, not here as in the *Historia* (XI, 2; IX, 1) and the *Draco* called Insula Avallonis, but "Insula pomorum que fortunata vocatur" (l. 908), because without cultivation it produces all fruits.²⁰ *Insula pomorum*, not found again

¹⁸ After *Life in Roman Paganism* (New Haven, 1922), p. 80.

¹⁹ I find no such view among the medievals. Beazley (II, 596) is mistaken in stating that the Beatus-St. Sever map confuses Taprobane with Antipodes-land. It merely places them next each other (Miller, I, plate at end).

²⁰ This trait in many paradise-like places; cf. Boethius, *De cons. phil.*, II, m. 5; Ovid, *Metam.*, I, 101.

before the end of the century in an interpolation in William of Malmesbury's *De antiquitate Glastoniensis ecclesiae*, is recognized as due to deriving Avallon from the Welsh *afalau*, 'apples,' or *afallon*, 'apple-trees.' I thoroughly agree with M. Faral's admirable book, that the foregoing description is due to early accounts of the *Insulae Fortunatae*,²¹ familiar in literature and shown in some medieval maps in the ocean west of Africa. But in the *Vita* account there is a clearer reminiscence of Taprobane: "Annis centenis aut ultra viuitur illic" (l. 915). M. Faral cites Solinus (cf. cap. 53), who seems to have used Pliny's citation (VII, 2) from an earlier writer that the folk of Taprobane enjoy "longissimam vitam sine ullo corporis languore"; "vitam hominum centum annis modicam" (VI, 22). Martianus Capella has much the same.²² The three last-named aver that Taprobane abounds in fruit.²³ Any alluring imaginary isle would be patterned after or identified with such places known through tradition.

Whether or not Stephen knew the *Vita*, here is an earlier writer who assigned to the isle of Avallon traits derived from respected accounts of Taprobane, a region which respected accounts had also identified with Antipodes-land; and who also identified the isle with a remote region in the ocean. Now this last is what Stephen seems to do. While he may not have thought much about the precise situation of his *Avallonis insula sacra*, and certainly does not say it is in or near Antipodes-land,²⁴ the fact that after Arthur is healed in this unknown

²¹ *La Légende arthurienne* ("Bibl. de l'Ec. des Hautes Et." (Paris, 1929)), II, 302-3. He cites only Isidor (XIV, 6, 8) as to these isles, and errs in mentioning Solinus as similar (capp. 23, 56). Cf. also P. Mela, III, 10; M. Capella, VI (Teubner ed., p. 244); Rab. Maur., *De rer. nat.*, col. 354; Pliny is less alluring (IV, 119).

²² *De nuptiis*, VI (p. 242).

²³ *Pomis abundare, pomis abundant, redundare pomis* (ll. cc.). Isidor and Solinus mention the *mala* or *poma* of the Hesperides, and Solinus those of the Canaries; naturally by tradition or imagination found in any attractive place.

²⁴ Fletcher (p. 146) even says he equates them; Miss Norgate (*Angevin Kings*, II, 57) says oddly that he puts it in Cornwall. No writer is known to precede him in this, and none to follow. Two routes may have led Stephen's mind to the Antipodes. A mysterious and remote isle for prolonged preternatural life might suggest their land among others; and Alexander, in the foreground of his consciousness, would suggest the southern Orient, the nearest known neighbor to the Antipodes. When the author of the thirteenth-century verse-paraphrase of Geoffrey apostrophizes Modred as rash in attacking

"Quem totus metuit mundus, quem totus obhorret
Antipodum populus,"

he may be alluding to the *Draco*, or to speculative talk, or indulging original hyperbole. His isle of Avallon is in the ocean, but more like the *Fortunatae*, etc., than Antipodes-land. See *Gesta regum Brit.*, ed. Francisque-Michel ("Cambrian Archaeol. Assoc." [1862]), pp. 151, 153. His very lovely description of the isle probably owes more to Latin writers than to any Celtic other-world. There is more erudition and less Celticism in all these descrip-

isle he is given dominion over the Antipodes (II, 1162 ff.) would naturally be taken as implying it. The suggestive thing is that Stephen chose this particular remote region in the ocean. His island is *sacra*,²⁵ and the abode if not of the dead at least not of the living in the ordinary sense, and he had the authority of Macrobius and others²⁶ for this view of the Antipodes, but he also had precedent enough to suit his needs for the same view of other remote romantic isles. Yet he rejects the charms of Taprobane and the rest. He might have chosen, as the *Vita* did, the Fortunate Isles; he might have chosen the earthly Paradise, conspicuously shown on most maps in the extreme east;²⁷ or the land of the Hyperboreans, who live in health to a vast age, familiar in literature, and shown in a half-dozen maps of the twelfth century and later in the extreme north, beyond the arctic region, a *gens beatissima*,²⁸ or the Hesperides, like the Fortunate Isles in the extreme west, and shown in one or two maps. These are more or less alluringly described by many writers, including Solinus, Capella, and Isidor, and discussions as to the site and charms of Paradise were extremely common. All of them have happy and poetic associations. Stephen has preferred to stand alone in placing Arthur's domain, with no alluring description, in a region blighted by orthodox disapproval, by skepticism, ridicule, and grotesque description and portraiture; to set him reigning perhaps over Skiapodes, Cynocephali, and Troglodytes, whose anatomy is even more harsh than their names.

All this is enough to show in what frame of mind he made Arthur king and commander of the Antipodes. What causes amusement varies so much from one epoch, race, class, and individual to another that it sometimes takes a portentous discourse to show that humor has evaporated; but the most arrant romanticist will agree that a feeling of amusement sometimes existed in the twelfth century. With the appalling gravity of modern scholarship, we are in less

tions than some think. Fletcher's book, usually so sound (p. 146), is wrong in every point in calling Stephen's Isle of Avallon "a typical Celtic earthly paradise, described with much poetic beauty"; he must have confused it with that in the *Gesta regum Brit.* We shall see how far Stephen of Rouen and Bec was likely to fall in with the Celts. It would seem to have been the zeal of the Glastonbury monks to gain Arthurian glory for their own house that at last pretty much stopped these remote romantic localizings of the Isle of Avalon (cf. Faral, II, 425, 430, etc.).

²⁵ 1162, 1176.

²⁷ Cf. Miss Paton, p. 42.

²⁶ See p. 15 above.

²⁸ As in Solinus (cap. 16); cf. Pliny, IV, 89.

danger of error in detecting this feeling than in ignoring it. The Antipodes could hardly fail to be a cue. The theological reasons for which early Christian writers had rejected them had been enlivened with the ridicule in which some of them were adept; easy quips about upside-down and falling-off were known to anybody. The characteristic medieval compromise between the classical belief in human Antipodes and the early Christian in none at all was a half-belief in non-human Antipodes, not sons of Adam. With the love of the grotesque in which the medieval artist reveled, the map-maker thoroughly enjoyed himself; parts of the earth hard by the Antipodes are covered with Skiapodes resting in the shade of their own feet, with men having four eyes or but one, or men whose heads do grow beneath their shoulders with faces in their bosoms. Such pictures excite even in us amusement more genuine than that of mere modern patronage; and since, as even the good medievalist will grant, even *homo sapiens* was less experienced and mentally hospitable then than now, they undoubtedly caused laughter. If Richard Brome could get fun for a seventeenth-century audience out of the upside-down and his Perigrine mad over the Antipodes, and if even the inquisitive Sir Thomas Browne could not "chuse" but accuse of madness the miserable Bishop that suffered in the cause of Antipodes for exposing his living on such a trifle, who can doubt that in the twelfth century a purely literary writer would adopt them only in a light, skeptical, and humorous context? The main thing is that they were unreal, discussed, as Neckam said later, only for speculation and entertainment.

J. S. P. TATLOCK

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

[To be concluded]

THE BACKGROUND OF PEIRE D'ALVERNHE'S CHANTARAI D'AQUEST TROBADORS¹

NO SINGLE Provençal poem has been so much discussed or so frequently quoted in recent years as Peire d'Alvernhe's satirical review of twelve contemporary troubadours and jongleurs. In this work Peire brings before us a group of his fellows, some of them great figures in Provençal literature, such as Giraut de Bornelh and Bernart de Ventadorn, others humble entertainers who go begging and singing from town to town. In each case Peire sketches a rapid caricature of his victim, ridiculing especially his appearance and his singing ability.

Throughout the poem runs a note of satire, it is true, but the dominant tone is one of banter, jest, or good-natured playfulness. Peire himself declares in the last line that it was composed "while laughing and playing,"² so that modern students are unanimous in looking at it as a joking occasional poem rather than as an attempt at serious literary criticism.³

But would these jokes about the figures and voices of the troubadours be understood by an audience unacquainted with the troubadours themselves? Would not the effect of the jokes be lost if Peire's models were not there to share in the fun? As Carl Appel puts it: "... Scheint es mir sicher, dass wenigstens eine Anzahl der Verspotteten gegenwärtig war, als Peire *jogan rizen* sein Gedicht den *enflabotz* vortrug. Erst dadurch erhält die Satire ihre rechte Pikanterie."⁴

¹ This article is the summary of a thesis entitled *A Literary Event in 1170: The Wedding of Alfonso VIII of Castile in Its Relations to Provençal Literature*, which was presented at Harvard University in January, 1931, and published in outline in *Summaries of Theses*, 1931, pp. 279-80. The author wishes to acknowledge a research grant from Wesleyan University which enabled him to consult documents and rare books in Spain. The author's thanks are especially due to Señor Valls Faberner, of the Archivo de Aragón in Barcelona, and to the Rev. Marcos Martínez, S.J., of Oña, for their aid in securing documents.

² The poem is published by Zenker, "Peire von Auvergne," *Romanische Forschungen*, XII, 761 ff.; by Appel, *Provensalische Chrestomathie*, No. 80; by Crescini, *Manuale ...*, No. 12; and by Bartsch-Koschwitz, *Chrestomathie prov.*, No. 85.

³ Philippson, *Das Mönch von Montaudon*, pp. 31-32; Appel, *Bernart von Ventadorn*, p. xx n.; Zenker, *Die Lieder P. von Auvergne*, p. 47; P. Rajna, *Romania*, XLIX, 89; Crescini, "Le caricature trobadoresche di P. d'Alvernha," *Nota seconda*, in *Atti del Reale Istituto Veneto*, LXXXVI, 203.

⁴ *Bernart von Ventadorn*, p. xxi n.

Consider the obscurity of some of the names which appear in the poem. Only five of the group have important places in Provençal literature; the remaining seven were probably not well known even in their own day. Three, indeed, are foreigners: the "vielhs Lombartz"⁶ is an Italian, while Peire de Monzo⁶ and Guossalbo Roitz⁷ are Spaniards. How could obscure jokes about these obscure people be appreciated by an audience which did not know them? Add to this the fact that the satire is largely personal, ridiculing the looks, the voices, and the mannerisms of the singers; that is, emphasizing qualities which Peire's audience must know well or have actually in view in order to appreciate the humor of his sallies.

It is such considerations as these that made scholars like Appel and Rajna⁸ see reflected in Peire d'Alvernhe's satire a joyous gathering of troubadours at which Peire arises in his turn, not to sing the conventional love song, but to make light of those who have already taken their turn at singing. The only critic who has taken exception to this hypothesis is Crescini, who is, however, sorely tempted by the idea. "Non discuto la tesi in se stessa: solo dico non sembrarmi che tutti gli argomenti dal Rajna con sì rara abilità escogitati valgono d'essa tesi alla sicura difesa e alla inoppugnabile riprova."⁹

One important circumstance concerning *Chantalarai d'aquest trobadors* is that it was first sung at "Puivert."¹⁰ Scholars are agreed that the allusion is to the town in the western part of the Department of Aude.¹¹ Although another town of the same name exists in France (Department of Vaucluse) and three other Puiverts are found in Catalonia,¹² none of these has preserved any medieval ruins or is mentioned in early records. The poem certainly reflects some convivial celebration which suggests a fête in the castle of a nobleman. At the Puivert in Aude are the ruins of an ancient castle, quite possibly the very

⁶ Rajna, *Romania*, XLIX, pp. 77 ff.

⁷ Crescini, "Le caricature ...," *Nota terza*, in *Atti*, LXXXVI, 1218.

⁸ Millá, *Los trovadores en España*, p. 434; Rajna, *Romania*, XLIX, 85; Crescini, *Manuale*, p. 480.

⁹ Appel, *Bernart von Ventadorn*, p. xxi n.; Rajna, *Romania*, XLIX, 91.

¹⁰ *Atti del Reale Istituto Veneto*, LXXXVI, 1235.

¹¹ Cf. II. 85-86: "Lo vers fo faitz ... a Puoich-vert. ..."

¹² Zenker, *Die Lieder P. von Auvergne*, p. 32; Appel, *Bernart von Ventadorn*, p. xx; Rajna, *Romania*, XLIX, 87-88; Crescini, *Atti*, LXXXIII, 782.

¹³ *Geografia general de Catalunya* (Provincia de Lleyda), pp. 175, 299, and 794.

stones which re-echoed Peire d'Alvernhe's stanzas and his auditors' mirth. But what motive could possibly have brought Bernart de Ventadorn, Peire Rogier, Raimbaut d'Aurenga, Giraut de Bornelh, and Peire d'Alvernhe all to this out-of-the-way spot at the same time?

One question remains: the date of the poem that we are studying. Scholars have come to place it between approximate limits of 1165 and 1173.¹³ The later date can be regarded as certain, since one of the figures of the poem is a "Sir Raimbaut" who is to be identified with Raimbaut d'Aurenga (d. 1173). The reasons for this identification are, first, the title "Sir," correctly given to Raimbaut d'Aurenga as a nobleman;¹⁴ and, second, the fact that of the five troubadours named Raimbaut whose work is known to us, only Raimbaut d'Aurenga is a contemporary of Peire d'Alvernhe.¹⁵

Since, however, this identification has sometimes been doubted, notably by Rajna,¹⁶ I think that we should call to witness another fact, never, to my mind, given proper emphasis. This is the fact that Peire d'Alvernhe seems almost certainly to have a definite poem by Raimbaut d'Aurenga in mind when he speaks of Sir Raimbaut. Peire's own words are:

E.l noves es en Raimbautz
 que.s fai de son trobar trop bauz;
 mas ieu lo torne a niën,
 qu'el non es alegres ni cautz;
 per so pretz aitan los pipautz
 que van las almornas queren [vss. 55-60].

Compare this quotation with a stanza from a rollicking, boasting song of Raimbaut d'Aurenga, which, by the way, also alludes to a joyous gathering and a poetic competition:

Per midonz ai cor estout
 et humil et baut,
 car, s'a lieis non fos d'azaut,
 eu m'estera en luoc d'un vout,
 que d'als non pensera mout,
 mas mangera e tengra.m caut

¹³ Appel, *Peire Rogier*, p. 10; Suchier, *Jahrbuch für romanische und englische Sprache und Literatur*, XIV, 121-22; Zenker, *P. von Auvergne*, pp. 31 ff.; Jeanroy, *Romania*, LVI, 503 n.

¹⁴ In early Provençal poetry the title *En* was restricted to noblemen; in later times the term came to be used indiscriminately.

¹⁵ Crescini, *Atti*, LXXXVI, 206-7.

¹⁶ *Romania*, XLIX, 82.

et agra nom Raembaut.

Joglars, per que.m desazaut?

ma dompna e vos mi faitz baut.¹⁷

Raimbaut twice tells us that he is haughty. "Yes, too haughty," replies Peire. Raimbaut goes on to say that, should he fail to please his lady, he would be like a statue—as if turned to stone—except, he says with a wink, he would eat and keep himself warm and be his usual self. No doubt Raimbaut is ridiculing the poetic extravagance of the troubadours, such as that of Marcabru, who declares that "the one who is in the throes of Love really dies of hunger and cold."¹⁸ Love may turn Raimbaut into a statue; he will still be well fed and warm. But Peire rejoins: "Yes, you are like a statue, but you are neither happy nor warm!" Does not this play of wit indicate that Peire had this definite work in mind as he composed his stanza on Sir Raimbaut?

If we accept this identification of Sir Raimbaut, we have an important clue to the date of *Chantarai d'aquest trobadors*, since Raimbaut d'Aurenga is said on good authority to have died in 1173 or 1174.¹⁹ But one of the poets who is caricatured, Giraut de Bornelh, could not have been writing very long before 1170. One of his songs was certainly composed after 1217,²⁰ and since we could hardly expect a poetic career of more than fifty or sixty years, the beginnings of Giraut's activity must fall not earlier than 1160 or 1170. Therefore *Chantarai d'aquest trobadors* must fall not long before the death of Raimbaut d'Aurenga, in the period from about 1165 to 1173.

¹⁷ Crescini, *Atti*, LXXXVI, 1237–38, and Appel, *Raimbaut von Orange* (1928), pp. 26 ff. We quote Stanza V and the *tornada*. "Joglar" is thought to be a *senhal* for Giraut de Bornelh, who also figures in *Chantarai d'aquest trobadors*. Cf. Kolsen, *Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie*, XLI, 551–52.

¹⁸ Dejeanne, *Poésies complètes de Marcabru*, No. VII, ll. 7–8.

¹⁹ This statement is made by Devic and Vaissette, *Histoire générale de Languedoc*, III, 799, which refers to the work of Joseph de la Pise, *Tableau de l'histoire des Princes d'Orange* (1838), as the source. Schultz-Gora (*Archiv für das Studium der neuen Sprachen*, CLVII, 299) says that he has examined the work of La Pise and has found the date 1177 given on p. 63, for the death of Raimbaut d'Aurenga. Had he looked more closely he would have discovered that the figure 1177 (given, by the way, in the margin, with no explanatory phrase) is the date of the beginning of the rule of another Raimbaut, the great-nephew of the troubadour! Had Schultz-Gora turned to the genealogical tables on pp. 64 and 48 he would have seen the end of Raimbaut the troubadour's rule given as 1173 in the first case and the beginning of his successor's rule as 1174 in the second. Since La Pise mentions having seen Raimbaut's will and other documents, we can hardly hope to find better authority.

²⁰ Diez, *Leben und Werke der Troubadours*, p. 113.

We have now completed our résumé of the work already done on Peire's satire. We are left, however, with several moot points, outstanding among them being the theory which supposes that the troubadours satirized by Peire were actually in his audience. This question is one of intense interest to the student of Provençal literature. What we should really like to have is a clear picture of the circumstances under which the poem was composed. I shall attempt to find a possible explanation of these circumstances in a study of the life of one of the men that Peire includes among the satirized troubadours, Guossalbo Roitz.

The name is undoubtedly Spanish, its form in Old Spanish being Gonçalvo Roiz, in modern Spanish Gonzalo Ruiz.²¹ To look for such a common name through the annals of twelfth-century Spain seems at first a foolhardy undertaking, especially since the form Roitz is not the family name, but indicates that Gonzalo's father had the Christian name Rodrigo or its shortened form Ruy. Our only guiding principle in this search must be that the Gonzalo Ruiz who appears in Peire's satire was very likely at Puivert at some time between about 1165 and 1173, at the time that Peire saw fit to ridicule his poetry.

Two circumstances greatly heighten the probability of Gonzalo Ruiz' personal attendance at this merrymaking at Puivert: his obscurity as a poet and his foreign nationality and speech. If Peire thought of Gonzalo as a literary man, how could he expect to interest his audience in an unknown poet whose very language was incomprehensible to it? And if the satire is personal, as we have seen that it tends to be, how could recondite quips about an unknown foreigner provoke laughter? Since Gonzalo Ruiz came from a foreign region, he would certainly be unknown to Peire's audience unless he were himself one of the revelers.

Fortunately our search through the histories does not go unrewarded. Jerónimo Zurita²² tells us of a Gonzalo Ruiz who was in Aquitaine and Languedoc in 1170 and whose route must have passed at least near Puivert if not actually through that place. This Gonzalo Ruiz was one of an imposing delegation of Castilian nobles and clergy-

²¹ Cf. above, n. 7.

²² *Anales de Aragón*, Vol. I, Book II, chap. xxviii. Zurita's statements are corroborated by two original documents dictated in 1170, now found in the Archivo de la Corona de Aragón at Barcelona, Documentos de Alfonso I, pergaminos 88 and 92.

men which went to Bordeaux to bring back to Spain the bride of Alfonso VIII of Castile. The bride was Eleanor, daughter of Eleanor of Aquitaine and Henry II, the Angevin king of England; and she came accompanied not only by her new Spanish subjects but also by a *cor-tège* of dignitaries from her parents' domains, most of whom dwelt in the duchy of Aquitaine. Queen Eleanor of England is known to have been in Bordeaux in August, 1170, to start her daughter on the journey to her new home, and since we do not know her whereabouts during the next three months, some historians have surmised that she accompanied the young bride for some distance on her way.²³

The route chosen by the wedding party could not go through the Pyrenees by the most direct route (i.e., by the passes of Roncevalles or Canfranc)²⁴ because the kingdom of Navarre, within whose borders these passes lay, had been for some years in a state of war with Castile. At the time of Alfonso VIII's accession to the throne (1158), the King of Navarre had seized the Basque provinces and had made raids as far as the very gates of Burgos.²⁵ These difficulties were not straightened out until arbitrated by Henry II of England in 1177.²⁶ There remained as possible routes for the wedding cavalcade either the high, wild passes above Bagnères de Luchon, where the distances between habitations were great, or the easy, low passes of the eastern Pyrenees on the highway from Bordeaux and Toulouse to Barcelona. The impracticability of the high passes of the central Pyrenees for a numerous group including many women and churchmen is obvious. Furthermore, the account in Zurita states definitely that the bride came into Spain through the possessions of the King of Aragon, and that the wedding took place in Tarazona, a few miles up the Ebro from Zaragoza and also in the domain of Aragon. In view of these facts, we are certain that the bridal group came to Spain through the eastern mountain passes and in its route went near, if not actually through, the hamlet of Puivert.

²³ A. Richard, *Histoire des comtes de Poitou*, II, 154-55; R. W. Eyton, *Court, Household and Itinerary of King Henry II*, pp. 137, 144.

²⁴ As stated by F. Fita, "Elogio de la Reina Leonor de Inglaterra," *Boletín de la Real Academia de la Historia*, LIII, 423. But Berganza (*Antigüedades de España*, p. 99b) tells us that Eleanor had to come into Spain by way of Aragon on account of the enmity of Navarre.

²⁵ Moret, *Anales de Navarra*, II, 481.

²⁶ Maura Gamazo, *Rincones de la historia*, p. 150.

Although the Gonzalo Ruiz who appears in the documents which refer to the wedding is not named with any distinguishing phrase,²⁷ he is to be identified with a man of that name often qualified as the "ruler of la Burueba," a *merindad* (small province) north of Burgos on the frontier of Navarre, containing such towns as Bribiesca, Pancorbo, Valpuesta, and Oña.²⁸ Since we know that the Gonzalo Ruiz who was in France in 1170 was an important nobleman, our identification of him with the ruler of La Burueba cannot be doubted, for he is the only important nobleman of that name to appear in the documents of that epoch.²⁹

On looking over the fifty-odd allusions to this ruler of La Burueba, most of which are limited to the appearance of his name as a witness to diplomas, it becomes evident that his life falls into three periods. During the first, which extends from about 1122 to about 1148, we see his name in twelve different places,³⁰ in seven of which he is called the

²⁷ Besides the Gonzalo Ruiz who went to France, pergamino 88 of the Archivo de Aragón names a "Gonzalo Ruiz *duque*." But we must remember that the title *duque* did not indicate a high noble during the Middle Ages, but, on the contrary, designated a minor military leader. Cf. *Las siete partidas*, Parte II, título 1, ley 11.

²⁸ For a description of La Burueba cf. J. Sanz García, *Boletín de la comisión provincial de Burgos*, I, 151 ff.

²⁹ We find a monk named Gonzalo Ruiz in the monastery of Corias (cf. Sandoval, *Historia de los reyes de Castilla y de León*, Don Fernando ... Don Sancho ... Don Alonso sexto ... Dona Urraca ... y Don Alonso séptimo, printed in Morales, *Cronica general de España*, Vols. XI-XII, esp. XII, 320). Outside the kingdom of Castile, we find a single reference to a Gonzalo Ruiz named as the *alférez* (standard-bearer) of the King (of Navarre?) in a document from the realm of Navarre, dated September, 1158. Cf. Moret, *Anales de Navarra*, II, 460b. But in the same history we find that other men are named as the holders of the office of *alférez* at the court of Navarre during the years 1155-65. Hence it is probable that the allusion is to Gonzalo Ruiz de la Burueba who held the position of *alférez* at the court of Sancho III of Castile during a period from about 1149 to about 1155.

In the Kingdom of Leon we find another unique allusion to a "Gundisalvus Roderici regis signifer" in the year 1171 (April 28). Cf. Monfar y Sors, "Historia de los condes de Urgel," *Doc. inéd. del Archivo de la Corona de Aragón*, IX, 400. But again, other documents of this same year from the court of Leon bear no trace of a man of the name which we are seeking. Cf. *Cartuario del monasterio de Eslonza*, pp. 141 ff. Therefore, we are again forced to conclude that the Gonzalo Ruiz appearing in this lone record must be the Castilian knight. We are still at a loss to account for the title *alférez* given him by the scribe, unless it was a purely honorary one given to him as a former incumbent of the office.

³⁰ In 1122 and twice in 1136 he is mentioned as ruler of La Burueba (Gudiel, *Compendio de algunas historias de España*, etc. [Alcalá, 1557], fols. 15-16). In 1144 he signed a diploma given at Burgos (Documentos de Oña in the Archivo Nacional at Madrid, Caja I, No. 56); in 1145 he signed the *fueros* of Pancorbo (Sandoval, *Historia*, XII, 245); in 1147 he is again said to be ruling la Burueba (Gudiel, fol. 16). He appears three times in 1148: on May 2 at "Castro surit" (Doc. de Oña, Caja I, No. 62); on May 10 at Burgos (Sandoval, XII, 285); and on November 20 when he is both one of the donors and a witness of a document given by the various branches of the Lara family (Salazar y Castro, *La casa de Lara*, IV, 8-9).

ruler of La Burueba. Another designates him as *filius comitis*.³¹ We also learn that his name appears many times in documents issued by the Emperor Alfonso VII in 1147; we may consequently gather that he took part in the great military campaign against Almería of that year.³²

Next follows a period, approximately from 1149 to 1155, during which we find citations of a Gonzalo Ruiz, *alférez del rey*, but no mention of the governor of La Burueba.³³ It seems that Gonzalo Ruiz of La Burueba temporarily held the position of "standard-bearer" to the king, an office which included many high military duties.³⁴ Still, this position at the court of Sancho III of Castile cannot be regarded as an extremely lofty trust, because Sancho's father, the Emperor Alfonso VII, was still alive and the virtual ruler of Castile.

By the time that Sancho became sole monarch of Castile (1158), Gonzalo Ruiz was no longer *alférez*, although his name still appears in many court documents.³⁵ Once more we find the qualification *tenente*

³¹ A writing from 1149 (February 15). Cf. L. Serrano, *Fuentes para la historia de Castilla*, I, 59.

³² Cf. Sandoval, *Historia*, XII, 269.

³³ We find him with the title *alférez* in documents dated February 27, 1149 (Nuñez de Castro, *Coronica de ... Don Sancho el Deseado, Don Alonso el Octavo, y Don Enrique el Primero* [Madrid, 1665], p. 16); on January 14, 1154, in Soria (Nuñez de Castro, p. 21); on October 18, 1154, in Toledo (Sandoval, *Historia*, XII, 318). During this period the name Gonzalo Ruiz appears accompanied with no identifying phrase in three writings from Oña dated March 26, 1149; February 14, 1150; and March 2, 1150 (Doc. of Oña, Caja, I Nos. 63, 64, and 65). The name also is found three times in the history of Sandoval (XII, 324, 326), all of which citations date from the year 1155.

³⁴ Cf. Menéndez Pidal, *La España del Cid*, p. 173.

³⁵ Let us list the citations of his name during this period. In a document from the year 1156 he is called the ruler of La Burueba (Sandoval, XII, 332); in January, 1158, he is in Almazán and signs the donation of the town of Calatrava to the newly founded military order of Calatrava (Gudiel, fol. 16r; Rades, *Historia de las órdenes militares*, fol. 6); in February, 1158, he appears at a town called "Naxama" (possibly the modern Nájara, OSp "Naxara") (Zurita, I, 68). Between 1158 and 1165 we find no mention of his name, but we must remember that between these dates Alfonso VIII, the new king of Castile, was only a child, and that his territories, including La Burueba, were invaded by the kings of Navarre and Leon. In 1165 Gonzalo Ruiz is again called the ruler of La Burueba (Gudiel, fol. 16r); in 1167 he is at Maqueda (Colmenares, *Historia de Segovia* [Madrid, 1640], p. 146); in 1169 he again appears as one of the donors and witness of a grant given by the family of Lara (Salazar y Castro, IV, 7); in the same year we see him again with the title of ruler of La Burueba (Manueco Villalobo, *Documentos de Santa María la Mayor de Valladolid*, p. 240); a document from Oña (Doc. de Oña, Caja I, No. 66) also of 1169 (March 1) connects his name with La Burueba, as do two donations of the year 1170 (Gudiel, fol. 16r; Doc. de Oña, Caja I, No. 67). In this important year 1170, when Gonzalo Ruiz made his trip to Bordeaux, we find him at Oña on June 24 (Doc. de Oña, Caja I, No. 68), at Zaragoza in July (Archivo de Aragón, Doc. de Alfonso I, pergamino 88), in Tarazona in September (*ibid.*, pergamino 92), and in Nájara on November 7 (Doc. de Oña,

Boroviam after his name in eight of these writings. After 1174 a new title is seen with his name, that of *conde*, in those days not a hereditary title but one conferred by special act of the king. We lose sight of our man after 1180, but we learn from another source that he became a monk at San Salvador de Oña, a flourishing Benedictine monastery and the intellectual capital of La Burueba. There he died, and there his tomb may still be seen in the *claustró de los caballeros*.³⁶

Various historians, starting from preconceived notions, have claimed this Gonzalo Ruiz for as many different families, including those of Girón, Sandoval, and Sarmiento.³⁷ We possess, however, a clear statement of his family history.³⁸ His father was Count Rodrigo Gómez and his mother Elvira Ramírez, sister of King García Ramírez of Navarre. The male line goes back to Gonzalo Salvadores, of the family of Lara, called *Cuatro Manos* on account of his great valor. That Gonzalo Ruiz belonged to the Lara family is further attested by two donations made by various nobles of that family and clearly listing our man as one of the group.³⁹

But how well do the words of Peire d'Alvernhe's caricature fit the governor of La Burueba, whose career was more that of the guardian

Caja I, No. 69). He signs a document in Burgos on November 29, 1171, calling himself "Gonzalo Ruiz de Burueba" (*ibid.*, No. 70).

After this time he begins to bear the title *conde*. In 1174 we read that Count Gonzalo is ruling La Burueba (Gudiel, fol. 16v); in two of the documents of Oña we see a Count Gonzalo as a witness in 1175, and on March 14 of this same year he signs himself "Count Gonzalo Ruiz" (*ibid.*). In 1177 a "Count Gonzalo" again appears in connection with a donation to Oña (L. Andrés, "Fueros ... de San Salvador de Oña," *Revista de archivos, bibliotecas y museos*, XXXIII, 134), and finally in 1180 "Count Gonzalo Ruiz" figures in a writing from Burgos (Gudiel, fol. 16v).

³⁶ In Fr. Antonio de Yepes, *Coronica General del Orden de San Benito* (1615), fol. 329, we read "segun memoria del archivo, en uno de los sepulcros, que esta en el claustró de esta casa, esta sepultado el Conde Don Gonzalo, Hijo del Conde Rodrigo Gómes, que fue monge profeso desta casa, y esta juntamente enterado con el dicho su padre." This is the earliest printed source of our statement, but the allusion to the archives of Oña can be traced back even farther. Through the great kindness of Father Marcos Martínez, S.J., I have a copy of a manuscript index of the archives of Oña written about 1480, which says: "Iten. El cõde dõ gõçalo. Iten. otro delos biefechores deste mon" fue otro deuoto caual" dõ gõçalo fijo del suao dicho cõde dõ rodrigo. ... Et esta sepultado en este monasterio."

³⁷ Gudiel (*op. cit.*) and Nuñez de Castro (*Espejo crystalino para generales valerosos, de desengaños para Christianos principes, ... que ilustraron las dos familias de Girones y Pachecos* [Madrid, 1648]) say without proof that he is a Girón; Sandoval (*op. cit.*, XII, 332) claims him for the family of Sandoval but gives him the same genealogy which we shall soon show connects him with the Lara family; finally, I. de Barreda (*Oña y su Real Monasterio*, pp. 126-28) states that Gonzalo Ruiz belongs to the Sarmiento family but also connects him with the Laras.

³⁸ Cf. Yepes, *Cronica*, fol. 329, and Barreda, *Oña y su Real Monasterio*, pp. 126-28.

³⁹ Cf. above, nn. 30 and 35.

of a dangerous border district next to the inimical kingdom of Navarre and that of *alférez*, or military leader at the court, than that of a poet? Peire says of him:

E l'onzes Guossalbo Roitz
 que.s fai de son trobar formitz
 tan que cavallairia.s fen;
 et anc per lui non fo feritz
 bos colps, tan ben no fon garnitz,
 si doncs no.l trobet en fugen [vss. 67-72].

"And the eleventh [troubadour is] Gonzalo Ruiz, who makes himself so satisfied⁴⁰ because of his poetry that his knightly valor goes to pieces;⁴¹ and never was good blow struck by him, no matter how well he was armed, if indeed he did not happen on it while fleeing."

The man who is the model of Peire's caricature, is, first of all, a knight. He has had, at least up to the present, a reputation as a fighter, since Peire says that "his knightly valor goes to pieces." He is said to be well equipped with arms. Hence we see that Peire is poking fun at a soldier by calling him a coward. Were he really so, Peire's statement would not be a joke; therefore, I see no reason to believe that the charge is serious.

It might be well to mention here that Peire d'Alvernhe made a trip to Spain in 1158,⁴² during the year that Sancho III was sole ruler of Castile after the death of his father the emperor. He was in Castile in the spring or early summer. Although I have not been able to find documents from the spring months of the year 1158 in order to ascertain whether Gonzalo Ruiz was definitely with the court at the time of Peire's visit, we do find him at the court in January and February of this same year.⁴³

Another consideration leads us to think that Peire might have met Gonzalo Ruiz in Spain in 1158. In the spring of this year a conference took place between Sancho and his uncle, Raimon Berenguer IV, Count of Barcelona and Prince of Aragon, who, by the way, is also

⁴⁰ *Formitz* may also mean 'perfect,' and perhaps 'honored' or 'rich' as derived meanings.

⁴¹ The interpretation of this line given by Levy (*Zeit. für rom. Phil.*, XIX, 158) is "that he makes a pretence of knighthood" (*qu'e cavallairia.s fenh*). This would make a rhyme *fenh:fugen*, occasionally found, but not correct. This reading, if correct, would not change our conclusions.

⁴² Cf. Zenker, *Die Lieder Peires von Auvergne*, p. 24.

⁴³ See above, n. 35.

mentioned by Peire in a poem written during this same year.⁴⁴ In the early summer these monarchs were joined by King Sancho of Navarre.⁴⁵ Such a gathering would be supremely attractive to both troubadours and noblemen; hence there is a strong possibility that the two poets met in 1158. They may then have begun a friendship, fostered by their common interest in poetry, which was to find an expression twelve years later in *Chantarai d'aquest trobadors*.

The evidence that we gain from the life of Gonzalo Ruiz leads to the conclusion that Peire's satire was written in late July, August, or early September of the year 1170,⁴⁶ at which time Gonzalo could be personally in Peire's audience. But the seemingly plausible theory of Appel and Rajna holds that many, if not all, of the satirized troubadours were in this same audience at Puivert. Have the facts we have unearthed any bearing on the lives of the other troubadours?

When we spoke of the possibility of this congregation we noticed the apparent lack of motive or drawing force which would bring so many singers together in such an out-of-the-way place. But Gonzalo Ruiz was with a large and brilliant group of noblemen from both Spain and Southern France. It is also practically certain that he was with the group of troubadours. Does it not seem probable that these two groups were in reality one, and that the troubadours were the entertainers which any large gathering of potentates would be sure to attract? Was not the presence of the wedding party in or near Puivert the cause of the grouping-together of the singers?

The *cortège* contained a queen, and for a part of the way it very likely also held another—Eleanor of Aquitaine, the greatest of all patronesses of Provençal art. It appears too that her daughter, although very young, must have been trained in the poetic art, as were her sister Marie de Champagne and her brother Richard Coeur-de-Lion. Among the clergymen in the suite were the archbishops of Bordeaux and Toledo and the bishops of Palencia, Segovia, Burgos, Poitiers, Saintes, and Périgueux. Among the noblemen from France were Rudolf de Faye, the Seneschal of Aquitaine, Elie, Count of Périgord,

⁴⁴ Cf. Zenker, *Die Lieder Peires von Auvergne*, p. 25.

⁴⁵ Zurita, *Anales*, I, 69.

⁴⁶ According to Zurita (Vol. I, Book II, chap. xxviii) and the confirmatory documents from the Archives of Aragon, Gonzalo Ruiz' trip to Bordeaux took place between July and September.

the viscounts of Chatelherault and Bordeaux, Arnaut Guilhen de Marsan, himself a troubadour, and finally several lesser nobles who were in relations with the troubadours of their day.⁴⁷ The Spanish contingent represented the cream of the Castilian nobility.

We know that the troubadours depended on gifts as their source of income. Here was largesse indeed! But the wedding itself, which was to take place in Tarazona, where the courts of Alfonso VII of Castile and Alfonso II of Aragon would be temporarily united, offered an even greater opportunity for the singers. Could it be possible that the group portrayed in *Chantarai d'aquest trobadors* was en route to Spain with Gonzalo Ruiz and the suite of the Angevin bride?

There are two ways in which an answer to this question may be sought. The first is by showing that large numbers of troubadours and jongleurs were to be found at contemporary Spanish weddings. We see, for example, that singers surrounded the bridal chamber of the Emperor Alfonso VII "in a huge crowd."⁴⁸ When Raimon Berenguer IV of Barcelona married Petronilla of Aragon, many entertainers, both men and women, were present.⁴⁹ Even at the weddings of the middle class the jongleurs were so numerous as to be a nuisance, as is shown by the complaints of the Saracen inhabitants of Tortosa to Alfonso II of Aragon in 1180.⁵⁰ Royal weddings in Spain covered a period of two or three weeks of feasting and celebrations, and in the present case we have the statement of our chronicler that the magnificence and lavishness of preparations surpassed anything known in Spain up to that time. Add to this the fact that Alfonso VIII of Castile, although a mere boy at the time of his wedding,⁵¹ was during later life a great patron of the provençal troubadours, eight of whom he is known to have

⁴⁷ Jaufre de Taunay, whose wife was the daughter of the troubadour Jaufre Rudel and was celebrated in the songs of Rigaut de Berbezilh (Chabaneau, *Histoire générale de Languedoc*, X, 251); Folques d'Archaic, who is with Jaufre de Taunay and the already cited Elias de Périgord, mentioned in the works of Bertran de Born (ed. Thomas, II, l. 36; X, l. 12 [pp. 14 and 58]).

⁴⁸ Menéndez Pidal, *Poesía juglaresca y juglares*, pp. 140-41.

⁴⁹ Milá, *De los trovadores en España*, p. 258, n. 1.

⁵⁰ *Ibid.*, n. 2.

⁵¹ He was fifteen, but in the Middle Ages one reached one's majority at this age. As for the possibility of his showing an interest in poetry at this age, we have the example of the Viscount Rogier of Béziers, who is known to have been a patron of Raimon de Miraval at a similar tender age. Cf. Andraud, *Raimon de Miraval*, p. 150. For facts showing that Alfonso VIII had already begun to rule in his own right, cf. Clot, "Une Chronique latine inédite," *Bulletin hispanique*, XIV, 255, n. 11.

entertained at his court;⁵² and that Alfonso II of Aragon, who was also to be present at the celebration, was not only a patron of the troubadours but a troubadour himself. Even as early as 1170 he was quite possibly writing, for one of his works, a *tenson* with Giraut de Bornelh, is said to date from before 1175.⁵³

A group of Provençal singers, whose art was highly admired in twelfth-century Spain as in all of civilized Europe, would be gladly received and richly rewarded had they followed the bride Eleanor all the way to Tarazona. The only proof of this theory, however, must come from the works of the troubadours themselves. We believe that we can show that certain poems of Raimbaut d'Aurenga and Giraut de Bornelh were written in Spain in the later part of 1170 or 1171, and that certain statements in their works show that some of the other figures of *Chantarai d'aquest trobadors* were with them about this time. Curious facts about Bernart de Ventadorn and his jongleur "Limozí" are also forthcoming, which show that they undertook a trip to a foreign court together. These are the claims we hope to substantiate in a later study.

At the present time it is well to inquire somewhat more closely into the route of the wedding party. On the way from Bordeaux to Aragon it must have passed through Languedoc, the domain of Count Raymond V of Toulouse, and it would seem probable, assuming that the main highways were followed, that the group passed through Toulouse itself. But Henry II of England, the father of the Spanish bride, had been hostile to Raymond of Toulouse. Do the historical facts of the case oppose our conjectured itinerary?

In 1159 Henry besieged Raymond and Louis VII of France (his predecessor as husband of Eleanor of Aquitaine and great political rival) in the city of Toulouse, yet for some unknown reason withdrew his troops just as his victory seemed certain.⁵⁴ Hostilities were concluded with a truce in 1169; and in 1170 Henry visited the shrine of Rocamadour in Raymond's land, traveling with an armed force but showing marked kindness to the people along his way.⁵⁵ Less than a

⁵² Jeanroy, "Les Troubadours en Espagne," *Annales du Midi*, XXVII, 141.

⁵³ Kolsen, *Giraut de Bornelh, der Meister der Troubadours*, p. 59.

⁵⁴ Lavissee, *Histoire de France*, III, 35.

⁵⁵ Devic and Vaissette, *Histoire générale de Languedoc*, VI, 41.

year later, in January, 1171, Raymond V shifted his allegiance from Louis of France to Henry of England!⁵⁶

This remarkable change of allegiance in one of the largest and richest counties of France was no doubt not the whim of a moment. We must look on the truce of 1169 as the beginning of the negotiations which led to the change. In this case, we can readily believe that Raymond of Toulouse, anxious to conciliate his new sovereign, would freely allow the passage of the peaceful bridal cavalcade through his lands.

Now Count Raymond of Toulouse figures in Peire's satire, where he is mentioned in deferential terms:

Ab Peire de Monzo son set,
pus que.l coms de Tolozal det
qu'anc no soanet d'avinen [vss. 43-45].

"With Peire de Monzo(n)⁵⁷ they [the satirized troubadours] are seven, since the Count of Toulouse, who never scorned anything becoming, said so; . . ."

This Peire de Monzo(n) whom the Count of Toulouse scorns was a Spaniard.⁵⁸ The only two places named Monzón which exist in Europe are in Aragon and Castile. Following our theory, we must see in this Peter either one of the Spanish delegation or a Spanish jongleur attached to their suite. But the Count of Toulouse makes a remark about this man which shows that he must have seen him personally and heard him sing.⁵⁹ It looks as if both the troubadours and the bridal escort had come through Toulouse and had been entertained somewhere in Languedoc by the Count of Toulouse himself.⁶⁰

Thus far our line of argument has proceeded from the evidence which led Appel and Rajna to believe that Peire d'Alvernhe's satire portrayed a gathering of troubadours at which many of the figures of

⁵⁶ Lavissee, III, 66.

⁵⁷ Zenker (*Die Lieder Peires von Auvergne*, p. 199) wishes to change the reading "Peire de Monzo" to "Peire Bremon." His emendation was opposed by Appel, in *Literaturblatt für rom. und germ. Philologie*, Vol. X, col. 109, in *Zeit. für rom. Philologie*, XIV, 160 and XX, 389; by G. Paris, in *Romania*, XIX, 618; and by Crescini, in *Atti del Reale Istituto Veneto*, LXXXVI, 1203-13.

⁵⁸ Cf. above, n. 6.

⁵⁹ Crescini (*Atti*, LXXXVI, 1212) wants to read this passage: "Con Peire de Monzo sono sette [i trovatori] da poi che il conte di Tolosa gli dette, cantando, una poesia leggladra, . . ." This reading would only strengthen our belief that the Count of Toulouse knew Peire de Monzo.

⁶⁰ Unfortunately, we have not yet unearthed documents enabling us to trace the whereabouts of the Count of Toulouse during the summer of 1170.

the poem were present as Peire first sang it in the castle of Puivert. Then we found that in 1170, near which date the satire must have been written, one of its personages, a Spaniard named Gonzalo Ruiz, passed through Southern France, going near, if not actually through, Puivert. Finally, we suggested that the brilliance of the group of nobles with whom Gonzalo Ruiz was traveling attracted these troubadours and jongleurs to the out-of-the-way hamlet of Puivert, and we suggested also that the troubadours were traveling toward Spain with the bride's *cortège*. No doubt there are breaks in this chain of argument, but the whole holds together remarkably well. When we come to examine, in another paper, the works of the troubadours who appear in *Chantarai d'aquest trobadors*, we shall find some noteworthy confirmatory evidence.

Let us close this study with a consideration of Gonzalo Ruiz as a poet. Peire definitely states that he is a poet—a fact which is in no way in contradiction to his career as a knight. There is little doubt that this earliest Spanish poet to be known by name wrote under Provençal influence, and perhaps sometimes in Provençal itself.⁶¹ In support of the possibility that he wrote in Castilian there comes to mind a bit of Castilian verse quoted toward the end of the twelfth century by Raimon Vidal,⁶² who says that he has forgotten the name of the author of this scrap of verse, the eight lines of which are enough, however, to show us that their author was thoroughly imbued with the Provençal concept of love.⁶³ Moreover, let us recall that on the back of a document written at San Salvador de Oña in 1201, only twenty-one years after Gonzalo Ruiz had become a monk at this monastery, we find copied by Abbot Pedro of Oña the verses of the *Disputa del Alma y del Cuerpo*.⁶⁴ I do not claim these verses for Gonzalo Ruiz although the possibility of his being their author must remain before us. They do show conclusively that Gonzalo Ruiz de la Burueba lived in a literary environment, despite his warlike profession.

We should note that Gonzalo Ruiz de la Burueba had frequent con-

⁶¹ Menéndez Pidal (*Poesía juglaresca y juglares*, p. 181) says that Castile must have produced an occasional poet who wrote in Provençal.

⁶² *So fo e.l temps*, ed. M. Cornicelius (Berlin, 1888), ll. 594-601.

⁶³ The use of such words as *dona*, *servir*, and *vassalh* shows the impress of the Provençal ideas of love.

⁶⁴ Cf. Filtzmaurice-Kelly, *Literatura española*, p. 18; Ford, *Old Spanish Readings*, p. 130.

tacts with Provençal literature, besides the relations which he had with Peire d'Alvernhe. Many Catalan and Southern French knights took part in the expedition against Almería, in which we have seen that Gonzalo Ruiz participated. Then, again, the famous *camino francés*, the route over which thousands of pilgrims traveled annually to the shrine of St. James, skirted the southern boundary of La Burueba, passing through Santo Domingo de la Calzada, Belorado, and Burgos. In Belorado there was even a permanent settlement of Frenchmen, most of them probably from Southern France.⁶⁵ Another well-used road from the Ebro Valley to Burgos passed through the very center of La Burueba, through Pancorbo and Bribiesca. It was along these routes that French architecture and French epic poetry were brought into Spain; why not lyric poetry also? Gonzalo Ruiz de la Burueba was in everyday contact with the pilgrim horde. It was from this relationship, the details of which we cannot record but whose reality is none the less evident, that he acquired a taste for the Provençal art of verse.

WALTER T. PATTISON

WESLEYAN UNIVERSITY

⁶⁵ Menéndez Pidal, *Orígenes del Español*, p. 506.

MACÍAS IN LEGEND AND LITERATURE

FROM the multitude of poets of the fourteenth- and fifteenth-century *cancioneros*, the name of Macías, the Galician troubadour, stands forth pre-eminently as the symbol of a faithful lover. He has enjoyed a considerable vogue with Spanish and Portuguese writers of his own and succeeding ages. The details of his life are more a matter of legend than of historical fact. Shrouded in the obscurity of the late Middle Ages, the legend has been subject to many errors at the hands of literary historians. Furthermore, few of the writers on the subject have attempted to give even a reasonably complete list of the literary allusions to Macías;¹ and those who have quoted or cited allusions have devoted practically no discussion or explanation to them. The present paper does not aim at exhausting the subject, but represents an attempt to give a more comprehensive picture than has yet been given of the rôle of Macías and of the Macías legend in Spanish literature, particularly up to the eighteenth century, and of the nature of the literary works and authors celebrating the fame of Macías.

There are three primary literary sources for the Macías legend, all of which agree in the essential fact of the Galician troubadour's death for love but differ in the details. Don Pedro, Constable of Portugal, is responsible for the first of these sources.² It is in the form of a gloss to his *Sátira de felice é infelice vida*, written between 1453 and 1455. It reads:

Macías, natural fué de Galicia, grande é virtuoso mártir de Cupido, el qual, teniendo robado su corazon de una gentil hermosa dama, assaz de servicios le fizo, assaz de méritos le meresció, entre los quales, como un día se acacesiesen amos yr á cavallo por una fuente (?), assy quiso la varia ventura

¹ The two most complete treatments, in which the principal allusions are given, are M. Menéndez y Pelayo, *Observaciones preliminares to the Obras de Lope de Vega* (Madrid, 1899), X, xxxix-lix, and Hugo Albert Rennert, *Macías, O Namorado* (Philadelphia, 1900).

² Cf. M. Menéndez y Pelayo, *Antología de poetas líricos castellanos* (Madrid, n.d.), VII, cx, and Andrés Balaquer y Merino, *Don Pedro el Condestable de Portugal* (Gerona, 1881). The Constable Don Pedro (1429-66) spent the years from 1449 to 1456 as an exile in Castile, and was *rey intruso* of Aragón for two years (1464-66).

que por mal sosiego de la mula en que cabalgaba la gentil dama, volcó aquélla en las profundas aguas. É como aquel constante amorador, no menos bien acordado que encendido en el venéreo fuego, nin menos triste que menospreciador de la muerte, lo viesse, aceleradamente saltó en la fonda agua, é aquel que la grand altura de la puente no tornaba su infinito querer, ni por ser metido debaxo de la negra é pesada agua no era olvidado de aquella cuyo prisionero vivia, la tomó á do andaba medio muerta, é guió é enderezó su cosser á las blancas arenas, á do sana é salva puso la salud de su vida. É despues el desesperado gualardon, que al fin de mucho amar á los servidores non se niega, por bien amar é sennaladamente servir ouo, ca fizieron casar aquella su sola señora con otro. Mas el no movable é gentil ánimo en cuyo poder no es amar é desamar, amó casada aquella que donzella amara. É como un dia caminasse el piadoso amante, falló la causa de su fin, ca le sallió en encuentro aquella su sennora, é por salario ó paga de sus sennalados servicios le demandó que descendiesse. La qual, con piadosos oydos oyó la demanda é la complió; é descendida, Macías le dixo que farta merced le havia hecho, é que cavalgasse é se fuesse, porque su marido allí non la fallase. É luego ella partida, llegó su marido, é visto así estar apeado en la mitad de la vía á aquel que non mucho amaba, le preguntó qué allí fazía. El qual repuso: 'Mi señora puso aquí sus pies, en cuyas pisadas yo entiendo vevir é fenescer mi triste vida.' É él, sin todo conocimiento de gentileza é cortesía, lleno de scelos, más de scelos que de clemencia, con una lanza le dió una mortal herida. É tendido en el suelo, con voz flaca é oios revueltos á la parte do su sennora iba, dixo las siguientes palabras: '¡O mi sola é perpetua sennora! ¡A do quiera que tú seas, ave memoria, te suplico, de mí, indigno siervo tuyo!' É dichas estas palabras con grand gemido, dió la bienaventurada ánima. É assy fenesció aquel cuya lealtad, fe é espeiado é limpio querer, le fizieron digno, segund se cree, de ser posado é asentado en la corte del inflamado fiijo de Vulcan, en la segunda cadera ó silla, más propinea á él, dexando la primera para más altos méritos.³

The second source is again in the form of a gloss, written in 1499 by the Comendador Griego, Hernán Núñez de Toledo, to the one hundred and fifth *copla* of the *Laberinto de fortuna*, or *Trescientas*, of Juan de Mena (1411-56).⁴ It is as follows:

La historia de Macías, que tan nombrada es entre los que siguen la malicia del amor, aunque he mucho procurado por saberla enteramente cómo passó, hasta agora no me ha acontecido hablar con alguno que me la supiesse relatar

³ A. Paz y Mella, *Obras de Juan Rodríguez de la Cámara* (Madrid, 1884), pp. 401-2, as quoted by Menéndez y Pelayo, *Observaciones preliminares*, p. xlv. The three sources have already been published by Menéndez y Pelayo, *ibid.*, pp. xli-xliv, and by H. A. Rennert, *op. cit.*, pp. 5-9. It is thought desirable, nevertheless, to reproduce them here as a basis for later discussion.

⁴ See J. Ortega Rubio, "Fernando Núñez de Guzmán (El Pinciano), estudio bibliográfico," in *Revista contemporánea*, CXXIV (1902), 513-25, and P. Groussac, "Le commentateur du *Laberinto*," in *Revue hispanique*, XI (1904), 164-224.

sino remendada y á pedazos. Lo que he podido colleger entre muchas é diversas opiniones que he oydo, es esto: que Macías fué un gentilhomme criado del Maestre de Calatrava D. ... , el qual tenia una donzella de gran hermosura, de la qual se enamoró Macías, y passó por sus amores mucha pena assaz tiempo sin que della pudiesse alcanzar cosa alguna. Andando el tiempo, el Maestre desposó esta dama suya. É ni por esto Macías cessó de la servir como de primero. De lo qual como sintiéndose por agraviado el esposo, quexóse al Maestre: y el Maestre castigó mucho de palabra á Macías: mandóle por muchas vegadas que se dexase de aquello: pero Macías, preso de amor de la señora, no se pudo retraer de la amar, y el Maestre, importunado de las continuas quexas del esposo, prendió á Macías, y estando en la prision concertóse el esposo con el carcelero que le tenia en guarda, que le abriese un agujero por el tejado que caia sobre la cárcel donde estaba preso Macías: y echóle por allí una lanza y matóle. Fué enterrado su cuerpo en un lugar del Andaluzía, cinco leguas de Jaen, que se llama Arjonilla.⁵

The third source is the narrative of Gonzalo Argote de Molina (1549—?). It is in reality merely the gloss of the Comendador Griego, retouched and embellished in spots. It begins thus:

Florecian en el Reyno de Jaen, en la frontera del Reyno de Granada, los hijosdalgo no tan solamente con esclarecidos y famosos hechos en las armas, mas con notables acaecimientos en amores. Era á esta sazón Maestre de Calatrava don Enrique de Villena, famoso por sus curiosas letras, cuyo criado era Macías, ilustre por la constancia de sus amores. El qual, dando al Amor la rienda que su edad y lozanía le ofrecian, puso los ojos en una donzella que al Maestre su señor servia. Y siendo estos amores con voluntad della tratados con gran secreto, no sabiendo el Maestre cosa alguna, y estando Macías ausente, la casó con un principal hidalgo de Poreuna.

The account of Macías' persistence in love despite the marriage of his beloved, his imprisonment, and death follows closely the version of the Comendador Griego. With a romantic touch, Argote de Molina concludes thus:

El cuerpo de Macías fué sepultado en la Iglesia de Sancta Catalina del castillo de Arjonilla, donde llevado en hombros de los caballeros y escuderos más nobles de la comarca le dieron honrosa sepultura. Y poniendo la sangrienta lança encima della, quedó allí su lastimosa memoria en una letra, que assi dezia:

"Aquesta lança sin falla,
Ay coitado!
Non me la dieron del muro,

⁵ *Copilación de todas las obras del famosísimo poeta Juan de Mena* (Sevilla, 1528), fol. xxxvi, as quoted by Menéndez y Pelayo, *Observaciones preliminares*, p. xli.

Nin la prise yo en batalla,
 Mal pecado.
 Mas viniendo á tí seguro,
 Amor falso, y perjuro,
 Me firió, é sin tardanza;
 Et fue tal la miña andanza
 Sin ventura."⁶

Don Pedro tells his story in a simple and straightforward manner. There is a conspicuous lack of detail in his narrative, especially as regards the names of persons and places connected with Macías' tragic end. Writing, as we shall see later, from eighty to more than a hundred years after the event, he undoubtedly was unable to gather more details. Upon an examination of his account, however, we suspect him of having given us only as much of the legend as he received on reasonably good authority.

On the other hand, the statement of Hernán Núñez at the beginning of his gloss is noteworthy: "*aunque he mucho procurado por saberla enteramente cómo passó, hasta agora no me ha acontecido hablar con alguno que me la supiesse relatar sino remendada y á pedazos.*" What he is going to set down he has collected from *muchas é diversas opiniones*, he tells us. He then proceeds to relate his version: Macías, a nobleman, serving under a Master of the military order of Calatrava (whose name for some reason he does not give us), is treacherously killed by a jealous husband, and buried at the village of Arjonilla. The new details embodied in this account are quite possibly correct. D. Martín de Ximena y Jurado, in his *Anales eclesiásticos de Jaén* (Madrid, 1654), says that the church of Santa Catalina, which was during his times a hermitage, "fue en tiempos antiguos la Iglesia Parroquial, y en ella está sepultado el Enamorado Macías ... como consta del epitafio de su sepulcro á donde se lee de letras antiguas lo siguiente: *Aqui Yace Macias El Enamorado*" (p. 171). If it be thus established on supposedly historical grounds that Macías was actually buried in the place indicated by the author of our gloss, then it is very probable that he may have had some connection with the Order

⁶ *Noblesza de Andalucía* (Sevilla, 1588), fols. 272-73. This stanza, which Argote de Molina claims was used as an epitaph, is the fifth and last stanza of Macías' poem, *Señora, en quien fiança*. The figure of Love's dart or lance was, of course, common to the medieval poets. It is very likely that the literal interpretation of the word *lança* in this poem is responsible for the little added detail of the bloody lance.

of Calatrava, for a large part of that region was then under the jurisdiction of the Order.

The principal difference between this version and Argote de Molina's is that the latter fills the blank left by Hernán Núñez with the name of Enrique de Villena. Other minor touches are added, such as the name of the murderer, the *hidalgo de Porcuna*, and the account of Macías' burial. The idea that the marriage took place during the absence of Macías is also the invention of Argote de Molina.

Of these three sources, the first is undoubtedly most in harmony with the actual facts of the case. While Pedro de Portugal was not, as Amador de los Ríos and Puymaigre have asserted,⁷ contemporary with Macías, still he was almost fifty years nearer his time than Hernán Núñez de Toledo, who in turn lived almost a century earlier than Argote de Molina. Nevertheless, the account of Argote de Molina is the one that has gained the greatest currency. Wherever elaboration of the legend has been desired beyond the general idea of Macías' suffering and death on account of love, writers (including a majority of literary historians and critics) have gone to this version. The earlier version may have been simply overlooked or lost in the long lapse of time, but of this we cannot be certain. More likely it has merely appeared unattractive to subsequent writers, perhaps even untrustworthy, because of its naïve lack of detail.

The probable time when Macías flourished and died has been the subject of much discussion and erroneous conjecture. Almost the only real clue we have to his dates is the famous *Proemio é carta* of the Marqués de Santillana (1398-1458), addressed to the Constable Don Pedro. This was written in 1449 and was meant to serve as an introduction to a collection of his own works sent to Don Pedro. The portion in which he mentions Macías follows:

Acuérdome, Señor muy manífico, seyendo ya en edat non proyecta, mas assaz pequeno moço en poder de mi abuela Doña Mençia de Cisneros, entre otros libros aver visto un grand volumen de cántigas, serranas, é deçires portugueses é gallegos, de los quales la mayor parte eran del rey don Donís de Portugal (creo, Señor, fue vuestro bisabuelo); cuyas obras aquellos que las leian, loaban de invenciones sotiles, é de graciosas é dulçes palabras. Avia

⁷ J. Amador de los Ríos, *Historia crítica de la literatura española* (Madrid, 1865), VI, 77, n. 2, and the Comte de Puymaigre, *La cour littéraire de Don Juan II* (Paris, 1873), I, 58. This error has probably arisen from confusing the Constable Don Pedro with his father, the Infante Don Pedro.

obras de Johan Xoarem de Pavia, el qual se diçe aver muerto en Galicia por amores de una Infanta de Portugal: é de otro Fernant Gonzalez de Sanabria.⁸ Despues destos vinieron Basco Perez de Camoes é Ferrant Casquiço, é *aquel grand enamorado Maças*, del qual non se fallan si non quatro cançiones; pero ciertamente amorosas et de muy fermosas sentençias, conviene á saber:

- I. Cativo de miña tristura:
- II. Amor cruel é brioso:
- III. Señora, en quien fiança:
- IV. Provey de buscar mesura.⁹

From an examination of the writers herein mentioned in connection with Macías, Rennert concludes that Macías must probably have flourished between the years 1340 and 1370.¹⁰ Both Basco Pérez de Camões and Ferrant Casquiço must be assigned to the middle of the fourteenth century; and, since the Marqués seems to mention Macías as a contemporary, Rennert's conclusion is probably correct. We are further confirmed in this opinion when later in his letter the Marqués de Santillana continues with these words: "Despues destos, en tiempo del rey Don Johan, fué el Arçediano de Toro." There can be little doubt that this king is Don Juan I (1379-90); and certainly if he came "after these," Macías preceded this reign. Obviously, those historians who have accepted more or less unreservedly the account of Argote de Molina as their guide, have placed Macías in a considerably later period than that in which he could possibly have lived.¹¹ For Don

⁸ Joam Soares de Pavia was supposedly born shortly after the battle of Ourique (1139). Cf. J. Amador de los Ríos, *Obras del Marqués de Santillana* (Madrid, 1852), p. 645. Fernant Gonzalez de Sanabria is placed by Lang, *Das Liederbuch des Königs Denis von Portugal* (Halle, 1894), p. xxxvi, among the poets of the time of Alfonso III (1247-79).

⁹ Quoted from Menéndez y Pelayo, *Antología*, etc. (Madrid, 1911), V, 25. This letter was first published in its entirety, with excellent notes for the time, by Tomás Antonio Sánchez in his *Colección de poesías castellanas anteriores al siglo XV* (Madrid, 1779), I, xlviii-lxii.

¹⁰ Macías, pp. 13 ff. This is an excellent work and the most complete treatise yet to appear on the Galician troubadour. The major part of this monograph, however, is devoted to a discussion and critical analysis of the twenty-one poems which are, with varying degrees of probability, assigned to Macías.

¹¹ A few are: Amador de los Ríos, *Historia crítica de la literatura española*, VI, 77 ff.; P. Martín Sarmiento, *Memorias para la historia de la poesía y poetas españoles* (Madrid, 1775), pp. 312-15; Sánchez, *Colección*, pp. 138 ff.; Bellermann, *Die Alten Liederbücher der Portugiesen* (Berlin, 1840), pp. 24-26; Juan Hurtado y J. de la Serna, *Historia de la literatura española* (Madrid, 1921), I, 182-83; J. Cejador y Frauca, *Historia de la lengua y literatura castellana* (2d ed.; Madrid, 1927), I, Part II, 81; Angel Salcedo Ruiz, *La literatura española* (2d ed.; Madrid, 1915), I, 372-74; George Ticknor, *History of Spanish Literature* (2d ed.; New York, 1854), I, 364 ff. However, Lang, *Das Liederbuch*, and Balist, "Geschichte der Spanischen Literatur," in Gröber's *Grundriss der romanischen Philologie* (Strassburg, 1885-97), II, Part II, 426, assign Macías to the middle or latter half of the fourteenth century.

Enrique de Villena,¹² with whom he has been so closely identified, became Grand Master of Calatrava in 1404, under the reign of his cousin, Don Enrique III (1390-1406), commonly called "El Doliente." Though a political failure (having been relieved of the mastership of the Order in 1414), he enjoyed the reputation of a learned man and a necromancer during the early part of the long rule of Don Juan II (1406-54).

The birthplace of Macías is another matter of controversy. That he was a Galician we are quite sure. His follower and disciple, Juan Rodríguez de la Cámara, called also "del Padrón" from his own birthplace in Galicia, makes this clear in his *Siete gozos de amor*, the *syn* of which is as follows:

Si te plase que en (?) mis dias
Yo fenesca
Mal logrado tan en breve,
Plégate que con Macías
Ser meresca
Sepultado; desir debe
Do la sepultura sea:
Una tierra los crió,
Una muerte los levó,
Una gloria los posea.¹³

Rennert points out that the word *tierra* here simply means Galicia, and nothing more definite; and this may or may not be exactly what Juan Rodríguez had in mind. He is wrong, however, in apparently supposing that Padrón is postulated as Macías' birthplace simply on the basis of this passage. As a matter of fact, it is another and entirely different passage which would seem to give stronger support to this claim. In his allegorical novel, *El siervo libre de amor*, Juan Rodríguez

¹² For a good account of this unfortunate scholar (1384-1434), see E. Cotarelo y Mori, *Don Enrique de Villena* (Madrid, 1896). Samuel M. Waxman, "Chapters on Magic in Spanish Literature," in *Revue hispanique*, XXXVIII (1916), 387-438, is especially good in connection with Villena's popular rôle of "hechicero." His connection with the Order of Calatrava is amply discussed by Georgiana King, *Military Orders of Spain* ("Hispanic Notes and Monographs" [New York, 1921]). Rennert, *Macías*, p. 15, n. 20, claims the existence of a *Carta de censo de un solar*, etc., granted in the year 1402 by Don Enrique in his capacity of Grand Master of Calatrava. This would seem to indicate that he was actually elected to this post two years earlier than is ordinarily considered to be the case.

¹³ *Cancionero de Lope de Stúñiga*, in "Colección de Libros Españoles Raros o Curiosos" (Madrid, 1872), IV, 62. This stanza is also found in the *Cancionero general de Hernando de Castillo* (Madrid, 1882), I, 370-71, though there is a distinctly different arrangement of the first six verses.

speaks definitely of Macías, "nacido en las faldas dessa agra montaña."¹⁴ Thus his birthplace is thought to be in the environs of the Roca de Padrón. Further documentary evidence to support the point seems lacking. The exact place of Macías' birth, of course, is not particularly important here. Next to nothing, besides the allusions in the primary sources cited, is known concerning his life. His own poetical works are negligible. The four poems mentioned by the Marqués de Santillana in his letter, together with a fifth, *Con tan alto poderío*, are contained in the *Cancionero de Baena*, and are all that can be ascribed to him with a high degree of certainty. The fame of Macías unquestionably rests on his tragic and romantic death, rather than on any literary achievement.

When Dantesque allegory invaded Spanish literature to an appreciable extent, in the early part of the fifteenth century, Macías was chief among the afflicted lovers to appear in various of the *Infiernos de amor*.¹⁵ In these compositions, the author visualizes a trip through an amorous hell, viewing famous ill-starred lovers. In some cases this hell is conceived of as an actual abyss, with real torments for the lovers. In others the writers do not emphasize the reality of the lower regions, the description being cast in a more fanciful and indefinite mold.

The precedent for this type of composition in Spain was established by the Marqués de Santillana with his *Infierno de los enamorados*, or *de amor*. The author is transported by Fortune to a dense mountain forest, where he falls asleep. Proceeding on his journey the following morning, he encounters a fierce boar, but is rescued by Hippolytus in the guise of a knight. He is then conducted to a gloomy castle in a valley, and here he beholds the afflictions of the unfortunate lovers. Among these is Macías, whom he thus addresses:

Desidme de qué materia
Tractays despues del lloro
En este limbo et miseria

¹⁴ A. Paz y Melia, *Obras*, p. 72.

¹⁵ This particular type of work in Spanish literature has been ascribed to the influence of Dante almost universally since the eminent medievalist, Amador de los Ríos. Cf. his *Obras del Marqués de Santillana*, pp. cxxvi f. Chandler R. Post's *Medieval Spanish Allegory* (Cambridge, 1915) is an attempt to show that these works emanate rather from a French influence.

Do Amor fase su tesoro;
Asymesmo vos imploro
Que yo sepa dó nascistes,
É cómo et cuando venistes
En el miserable choro.

In the next four stanzas (the sixty-first to the sixty-fourth, inclusive, of the work), Macías satisfies the queries of the Marqués:

Bien como la serena
Quando planne á la marina,
Començó su cantilena
La una ánima mesquina,
Disiendo: "Persona digna,
Que por el fuego passaste,
Escucha, pues preguntaste,
Si piedat algo te inclina.

La mayor cuyta que haber
Puede ningund amador
Es membrarse del plaser
En el tiempo del dolor;
É maguera quel ardor
Del fuego nos atormenta,
Mucho más se nos aumenta
Esta tristesa et langor.

Ca sabe que nós tractamos
De los bienes que perdimos
É la gloria que passamos,
Mientra en el mundo vivimos
Fasta tanto que venimos
Á arder en esta flama,
Á dó non curan de fama
Nin de las glorias que hobimos.

É si por ventura quieres
Saber por qué soy penado,
Pláseme porque si fueres
Al tu syglo trasportado
Digas que fuf condenado
Por seguir de Amor sus vias;
É finalmente, Maças
En Espanna fuf llamado."¹⁶

¹⁶ *Cancionero de Stúñiga*, pp. 114-16.

Following this encounter, the Marqués is suddenly transported back to his natural state.

Juan de Mena's *Laberinto* (1444), another composition of the same class, is composed of two hundred and ninety-seven stanzas.¹⁷ The framework of the poem is cumbersome, though there are interspersed throughout many excellent passages. The author is transported to the Palace of Fortune, within which are three wheels, symbolic of the past, present, and future. The wheels of the past and future are motionless, but that of the present moves. On the first two are fixed seven circles, which represent the seven planets, and within each circle dwells a particular class of people. Thus, the *Orden de Diana* is the abode of the chaste, while the *Orden de Venus* is that of the sensual and lovelorn. The one hundred and fifth *copla*, in this latter *Orden*, runs as follows:

Tanto andouimos el cerco mirando,
que nos fallamos con nuestro Maçias,
e vimos que estaua llorando los dias
con que su vida tomo fin amando;
llegueme mas çerca turbado yo, quando
vi ser vn tal onbre de nuestra naçion,
e vi que dezia tal triste cançion,
en elegiaco verso cantando:

After this, Mena puts into the mouth of Macías the three following *coplas*, which by common agreement are far superior to any which Macías himself ever wrote:

Amores me dieron corona de amores,
porque mi nonbre por mas bocas ande:
entonces non era mi mal menos grande,
quando me dauan plazer sus dolores;
vençen el seso los dulçes errores,
mas non duran sienpre segund luego plazen;
pues me fizieron del mal que vos fazen,
sabad al amor desamar, amadores.

Fuyd vn peligro tan apassionado,
sabad ser alegres, dexad de ser tristes,
sabad deservir a quien tanto seruistes,
a otro que amores dad vuestro cuydado;

¹⁷ Accounts of Juan de Mena may be found in all literary histories. The statement by Sarmiento, *Memorias*, p. 315, that Mena "alcanzó vivo á Macías," is obviously incorrect.

los quales si diessen por vn yqual grado
sus pocos plazerres segund su dolor,
non se quexara ningun amador,
nin desesperara ningun desamado.

E bien como quando algun malfechor,
al tiempo que fazen de otro justicia,
temor de la pena le pone cobdicia
de alli adelante beuir ya mejor,
mas desque passado por el el temor
buelue a sus vicios como de primero,
assi me boluieron a do desespero
deseos que quieren que muera amador.¹⁸

In Juan de Andújar's *Como procede fortuna*, etc., called by some *Visión de amor*, the author is allowed to behold the throne of Justice, before which files a throng of famous lovers. Practically all of these are drawn from antiquity, Macías being one of the few contemporaries mentioned. He follows such ancients as Orpheus and Theseus. Says Juan de Andújar:

É vi al músico Orfeo
Andar sonando la lira,
E vi al fijo de Ageo
Contra Cupido con ira,
É vi despues que se tira
Contraversa de la Urias,
Et vi despues á Macias
É otros que de sus dias
Amor asy los regira.¹⁹

Among the later *Infiernos de amor* which upheld the fame of Macías was that of Garci Sánchez de Badajoz, who flourished under the Catholic Monarchs.²⁰ The fifth stanza of the work reads as follows:

En entrando vi assentado
en vna silla a Maçias,
delas heridas llagado
que dieron fin a sus dias,
y de flores coronado:

¹⁸ *Cancionero castellano del siglo XV*, ed. R. Foulché-Delbos (Madrid, 1912), I, 163 (Vol. XIX of "Nueva B. A. E.").

¹⁹ *Cancionero de Stúñiga*, p. 75.

²⁰ Sánchez de Badajoz (1460?-1526?) is one of the better poets whose works were contained in the *Cancionero general* of 1511. Cf. E. Cotarelo y Mori, *Estudios de historia literaria de España* (Madrid, 1901), pp. 33-52.

en son de triste amador
diziendo con gran dolor,
vna cadena al pescuezo,
de su cancion el empieço:
Loado seas, Amor,
*por quantas penas padeço.*²¹

Menéndez y Pelayo's statement that Macías was "personaje obligado en todos los *Infiernos de amor*, desde el que compuso Don Íñigo López de Mendoza hasta los que metrificaron Guevara y Garci Sánchez de Badajoz"²² would lead one to expect the celebration of Macías also in Guevara's work. This, however, is not the case. For Guevara's *Infierno* is cast entirely in the fanciful mold. His hell is simply his lady's disfavor, and hence he encounters no mortals at all. That Guevara's *Infierno de amores*²³ was written before Sánchez de Badajoz's *Infierno d'amor* is plain from the latter's assertion in the first *copla*:

Vime entre los amadores,
En el *Infierno d'amores*,
De quien escribe Guevara.

Guevara wrote a similar work, beginning *Recontar si mal senti*,²⁴ in which the refrain *Loado seas, Amor* is employed, though it is distinctly assigned here to a *señor de Benavente*.²⁵ This, it will be observed, is the same verse as that sung by Macías in the *Infierno* of Garci Sánchez de Badajoz. The latter's "su cancion" would not necessarily indicate that Macías was its author. Lang has spoken of the difficulty of assigning this particular verse.²⁶ It appears to have been a popular theme of the time.

The last of the important Dantesque compositions in which Macías figures is the *Residencia de Amor* of Gregorio Silvestre.²⁷ In this narra-

²¹ *Cancionero castellano del siglo XV* (Madrid, 1915), II, 631 (Vol. XXII of "Nueva B. A. E.").

²² *Antología*, etc. (Madrid, 1918), IV, lx-lxi. This Fernando de Guevara was the son of Pedro Vélez de Guevara, an uncle of the Marqués de Santillana, mentioned in his *carta*.

²³ *Cancionero castellano del siglo XV*, Vol. II, No. 894.

²⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 506. It is also found in the *Cancionero general de Castillo*, I, 434, and here entitled *Coplas suyas, d una partida qu'el Rey don Alonso hizo de Arévalo*. The editors' note estimates that it was written about 1465 or 1466.

²⁵ Undoubtedly Don Rodrigo Alfonso Pimentel, Conde de Benavente.

²⁶ *Cancioneiro gallego-castelhano, the extant Galician poems of the Gallego-Castilian lyric school (1350-1450)*, edited with notes by Henry R. Lang (New York, 1902), pp. 209-10.

²⁷ For an account of this poet (1520-69), see H. A. Rennert's article, "Gregorio Silvestre and his *Residencia de Amor*," in *Modern Language Notes*, XIV (1899), 229-33. Portions of the *Residencia*, including that here reproduced, are given in this article.

tive, we have Macías carried before Love for judgment by four other famous poets—Juan Rodríguez del Padrón, Juan de Mena, Fernando de Guevara, and Diego López de Haro. The sentence of Love is:

Que son todas niñerías
Que la ocasión levantó,
Y el fino amante Macías
Que por solo amor murió.

The *Infierno* of Garci Sánchez de Badajoz and the *Recontar si mal senti* of Guevara are combinations of the type of the amorous hell and another type of work that was very popular during the fifteenth century. This is the sort of composition in which each stanza closes with (or is immediately followed by) the first line or lines of some favorite song. In some of these works a singer is named for each song. Guevara mentions as many as eight singers, whom he may or may not have regarded as the actual authors of the songs ascribed to them. Sánchez de Badajoz names about thirty such singers. In other similar works, only one singer appears to sing all the refrains; in still others, no singer is named, in which case, if there be more than one song quoted, we are left to conjecture as to the singer's identity.

One of the best of such compositions is the *Querella de amor* of the Marqués de Santillana. It purports to be an account of Macías, run through with a rude shaft, complaining of the loss of his loved one. It reads as follows:

Ya la grand noche passaba
Et la luna se ascondia,
La lumbré clara del día
Radiante se mostraba,
Al tiempo que reposaba
De mis trabaíos é pena
Oy triste cantilena
Que tal canto pronunciaba:

Amor cruel et brioso,
Mal haya la tu altesa,
Pues non fases ygualesa
Seyendo tan poderoso.

Desperté como espantado
É miré dónde sonaba
Quien de amores se quexaba

Bien como dannificado;
 Vi hombre ser llagado
 De un golpe mortal de flecha
 Cantando atal éndecha
 Con semblante atribulado:

*De ledo que era, triste,
 ¡Ay, amor! tu me tornaste,
 La hora que me quitaste
 La sennora que me diste.*

Díxele: ¿por qué faseys,
 Sennor, tan esquivo duelo,
 Ó si puede haber consuelo
 La cuyta que padisceys?
 Respondióme: fallareys
 Mi dolor ser tan exquiva
 Que iamas en cuanto viva
 Cantaré como veréys:

*Con tan alto poderío
 Amor nunca fué yuntado,
 Nin con tant orgullo é brío
 Como vi por mi pecado.*

¿Non puede ser al sabido,
 Repliquéle, de su mal,
 Nin la causa especial
 Porque fue assy ferido?
 Respondió: troque et olvido
 Me fueron assy ferir,
 Por do me convien desir
 Este cantar dolorido:

*Crueldat et trocamiento
 Con tristesa me conquiso,
 Pues me dexa quien priso
 Ya non se manparamento.*

Amigo, segund paresçe,
 La dolor que vos aquexa
 Es alguna que vos dexa
 Que de vos non se adolesce.
 Respondióme: quien padisce
 Cruel plaga por amar,
 Tal cancion debe cantar
 Iamas, pues le pertenesce:

*Cativo de mi tristura,
Ya todos toman espanto,
E preguntan qué ventura
Fué que m'atormenta tanto.*

Díxele: non vos quexey
Que non soys vos el primero
Nin sereys el postrimero
Que possea el mal que habeys.
Respondiome: non cureys,
Sennor, de me consolar,
Que mi vida es querelar
Cantando segund veréis:

*Amor, siempre partiré
De vos assy me quezando,
Pues por vos servir loando
Soy á tiempo de morire.*

Él ya muy poco sonaba
Nin á vese se oya,
Manifiesto es que vey
Que la muerte lo aquexaba.
Pero iamas non cessaba
Nin cessó con grand quebranto
Este doloroso canto
Á la sason que esperaba:

Fyn

*Pues plaser non puedo haber,
Á mi querer et de grado,
Más val morir que non ver
My bien perder, ¡Oh cuytado!*²⁸

²⁸ So great a confusion exists concerning the arrangement of the stanzas of this poem, the choice of refrains, etc., as almost to preclude the possibility of drawing any valid conclusions. The arrangement above is that of the *Cancionero de Stúñiga*, pp. 44-47, and the *Marqués de Santillana: canciones y dichos*, in "Clásicos Castellanos" (Madrid, 1913), XVIII, 161-68. The version of this work mentioned by Rennert, *Macías*, p. 19, and also the one contained in Sánchez, *Colección*, pp. 143-46, contains the refrain *Pues me fallació ventura* instead of *Con tan alto poderío*, and *Pero te sirvo sin arte* in place of *Amor, siempre partiré*. Menéndez y Pelayo, *Antología* (Madrid, 1923), II, 123-26, together with Puy-malgre, *La cour littéraire de Don Juan II*, pp. 34-37, and the *Cancionero castellano del siglo XV*, I, 551-52, employs the same choice of refrains as Sánchez and Rennert, but with a different arrangement. The refrains *Crueldat et trocamiento*, *Cativo de mi tristura*, and *Pero te sirvo sin arte* are rearranged in the order of 2-3-1, along with their stanzas. Furthermore, the last halves of the two stanzas having as their refrains *Pues me fallació ventura* and *Pero te sirvo sin arte* have been interchanged. The *Querella de amor* given in the *Cancionero general de Castilla*, I, 92-93, is composed of the first, second, and third stanzas (of the version quoted above), with their refrains; the fifth without a refrain; and the

Another work almost identical in its general conception is the following composition of Antón de Montoro:²⁹

Ai cuitado, agora sento
que por meu mal connocei
tanto ben como perdi
por cobrar tal perdimento.

Os meus dias ja passaram
en que eu viver soía
con prazer e alegria
todo o tempo que duraron.
Pois non sei amparamento
"Loado sejas, Amor,"
que "A Deus, mia boa Sennor"³⁰
foi causa de meu tormento.

Ordenar quero mia vida,
pois son posto en tal cuidado,
que morrer devo, cuitado,
ou fazer vida perdida:
E será posto [en pensamento]:
"Rousinol, vejo-te queixoso";
"Amor cruel e brioso"
fará por mi comprimento.

Ja non posso mais durar
esta vida padecendo,
e pois moiro assi vivendo,
vivo me quero enterrar,
[e será o enterramento:]

seventh with the *fyn* or *cabo*. Amador de los Ríos, *Obras del Marqués de Santillana*, pp. 400-404, shows that there are still other variations of this composition. Why this diversity should exist is not clear. In all of the foregoing arrangements there is either one or two of the three following refrains: *Pero te sirvo sin arte*, *Con tan alto poderlo*, and *Crueldad et trocamiento*. The importance of this observation lies in the fact that the Marqués himself, in his *carta* to Don Pedro, specifically assigned these three poems respectively to Pero González de Mendoza, the Marqués' grandfather; Alfonso González de Castro; and the Arçedlano de Toro. Thus we may conclude that the Marqués evidently did not intend his singer to be understood as the author of all the refrains sung.

²⁹ For Montoro (1404-80?), called "el Ropero de Córdoba," see Menéndez y Pelayo, *Antología*, etc. (Madrid, 1920), VI, xx-xxxi, and Amador de los Ríos, *Historia crítica de la literatura española*, VI, 151 ff.

³⁰ Rennert, *Macías*, p. 60, rightly questions the possibility of this as a verse of Macías, but appears not to know exactly to whom it should be assigned. In the *Cancioneiro gallego-castelhano*, p. 111 (No. LXII), it is ascribed to Santafé, the Aragonese poet of the reign of Alfonso V of Aragon.

"Cativo! de mia tristura";
 "Pois me faleceu ventura"—
 cobrirá meu moimento.²¹

This short poem by Gonçalvo de Torquemada²² is found also in the *Cancioneiro gallego-castelhana*:

Un día por mia ventura
 fora-me eu acercar
 en ùa val mui escura
 onde ouve gran pesar,
 por que vi ali estar
 un ome desesperado,
 cantando desaguizado
 un cantar con amargura:

*Cativo! de mia tristura
 ja todos prenden espanto
 e preguntan que ventura
 é que m'atormenta tanto* [p. 123].

This refrain, already observed in Montoro's plaint and in the *Querella de amor*, is the beginning of one of the best authenticated of the poems of Macías. Wherever it is found, there is little doubt that the reference is to Macías. It is of a more personal appeal and would not so readily tend toward the currency we find in the case of the generalized *Ladoo seas, Amor* theme.

A slight variation is introduced into this refrain in an anonymous poem of the *Cancionero de Herberay*.²³ This is a rather long composition in a distinctly facetious vein. For the various letters of the alphabet there are units, composed of two stanzas and a refrain. The refrain always begins with the letter under which that unit stands; and that particular letter is employed throughout the entire unit as much as possible. The unit under the letter *K* uses the verse of Macías, *Katibo de miña tristura*:

²¹ *Cancioneiro gallego-castelhana*, p. 101.

²² Nothing is known of this poet. Lang, in his notes, p. 233, says that his name occurs in only one extant collection of songs, a *Cancionero* MS of the fifteenth century (No. 1) in the Biblioteca Patrimonial of Madrid. The index of this *Cancionero* is printed in the *Cancionero de Baena* (Madrid, 1851), p. lxxxvi, where Gonçalvo de Torquemada is given two compositions in addition to the one here quoted.

²³ In Bartolomé José Gallardo, *Ensayo de una biblioteca española de libros raros y curiosos* (Madrid, 1863), Vol. I, cols. 555-62. The editors' note to this composition reads: "Hállase esta composición ... sin título ni encabezamiento de ninguna clase que indique dónde, cómo, y por quién fué hecha."

El señor rey por K vino,
 Y por K tornó a Karmona,
 Su huésped es Kostantino
 Y Katerina la su dona,
 Kalandrias serán las aves
 Que combrá maguer que callo,
 Mas si se fallan las llaves
 Del establo algun vassallo
 A cenar haurá un cauallo.

La fruta será kastanyas
 De las mesmas de la tierra,
 El fuego será de kanyas
 Que vedada está la sierra,
 "Katiuo de miña tristura"
 Le canten porque castigue.
 Quien ama bien sauentura,
 Y si mal siempre aconsigue,
 Diga el refran que se sigue:

*Kastigame mi madre
 Yo trompegelas.*

In the *Cancionero catalán de la Universidad de Zaragoza*,³⁴ is a poem, called the *Desconort*, by Mosén Pedro Torrellas. It is a long composition, consisting of fifty-seven stanzas of varying lengths. Twenty-eight poets are made to recite verses alternately with Torrellas himself. Among these are Villasandino, Santillana, Juan de Mena, Juan de Torres, Santafé, Juan de Dueñas, and Macías, of the Spanish, together with many other Catalan, Provençal, and French poets. The forty-fourth stanza, recited by *Masias*, is as follows:

No por quel mercedimento
 A ti lo manda
 Mas por tu merçet complida
 Duelete del perdimento
 En que anda
 Mia ventura he vida
 Fas que non sea perdida
 En ti la mi speranza.³⁵

³⁴ Zaragoza, 1896. The major part of this *Cancionero*, which was compiled about 1460, is devoted to the works of Torrellas and Ausias March (1379-1459), the great Valencian poet. The *Desconort* is found from folio 234 to 241.

³⁵ P. 201. This is one of the stanzas of Macías' poem, *Señora, en quien fiança*, mentioned by the Marqués in his celebrated letter.

The last³⁶ of these compositions in which popular songs are employed as refrains is Rodríguez de la Cámara's *Cerca el alba, cuando están*, a work of seven stanzas, placed, together with another poem, at the end of his novel, *El siervo libre de amor*. The refrain *Cativo de mi tristura*, with three others, is again incorporated in the poem, and Macías is mentioned by name. From the middle of the fifth stanza to the end of the poem, we read:

En señal de alegría
Cantaba con grande afán
La antigua canción mía:
Pues que Dios y mi ventura
M'ha traído a tal estado;
Cantaré con gran cuidado:
¡Cativo de mi tristura!

No sé qué postremería
Hayan buena los mis días,
Cuando el gentil Macías
Priso muerte por tal vía.
Por ende en remembranza
Cantaré con amargura:
*Cuydados imaginanza,*³⁷
Cativo de mi tristura.

Los que me vieren así
No hayan a maravilla
Mi grave cuyta y mancilla;
Que tal Señora perdí.
Por lo cuál por tribulanza
Cantaré con amargura:
Ya, señora: ¡En quien fianza,—
*Cativo de mi tristura?*³⁸

³⁶ It will be observed that "last" here refers only to the order in which the compositions are being treated. Montoro's poem, for instance, should be placed chronologically after the present work. In probably a majority of cases, however, a chronological arrangement of poets and poems would be utterly impossible to attain.

³⁷ This is another popular refrain which is attributed to Macías, presumably mainly on the basis of this work.

³⁸ In Gallardo, *Ensayo* (Madrid, 1889), Vol. IV, cols. 225-26. Juan Rodríguez's expression, *canción mía*, apparently refers only to the refrain *Pues que Dios y mi ventura*, though even this is seriously considered as a work of Macías by C. M. de Vasconcellos, "Geschichte der portugiesischen Literatur," in Gröber's *Grundriss*, II, Part II, 240, and by Rennert, *Macías*, pp. 18-19, who adds one poem to the total of twenty listed by the former for the troubadour. Menéndez y Pelayo, *Antología*, etc., V, ccxvii, and Paz y Melia, *Obras*, pp. 78-79, give a version of the poem in which the three verses beginning with *Pues que Dios y mi ventura* are omitted, without the customary suspension points to indicate an omission. Such a reading would make the *canción mía* refer rather to *Cativo de mi tristura*, and would constitute an arrangement more difficult to explain.

Of single individuals who have helped to perpetuate the memory of Macías, Rodríguez de la Cámara has done the most. To the three works of his already mentioned, wherein our poet is celebrated, two more must be added. One is the somewhat humorous short poem—a charming bit—*Sólo por ver á Macías*:

Sólo por ver á Macías
É de amor me partir
Yo me querria morir,
Con tanto que resurgir
Pudiese dende á tres dias.

Mas luégo que resurgiese
Quien me podria tener
Que en mi mortaia non fuese,
Lynda sennora, á te ver,
Por ver qué planto farias,
Sennora, ó qué reyr;
Yo me querria morir
Con tanto que resurgir
Pudiese dende á tres dias.³⁹

The other allusion to Macías is in his *Cadira de honor*. The *Triunfo de las donas*,⁴⁰ while really a separate prose work, is usually treated as a kind of introduction to the *Cadira de honor*. In this work, Juan Rodríguez speaks in the most flattering tones of the "varon constante, generoso, bien ensennado Maçias, de loable e piadosa recordaçion."⁴¹ He goes on to say that Macías is the only one at the time worthy of the "frondes de Daphne."

Garci Sánchez de Badajoz's *Liciones de Job, apropiadas a sus pas-*

³⁹ *Cancionero de Stúhiga*, p. 140.

⁴⁰ This is one of the several compositions written in praise of women, reacting against Boccaccio's scathing works, *Il corbaccio*, or *Laberinto d'amore*, and *De claris mulieribus*.

⁴¹ Paz y Melia, *Obras*, p. 138. In Vol. I, col. 249, Gallardo describes a MS of this work which is attributed to Don Enrique de Villena. It is a MS in folio, in a hand of the fifteenth century, in the Library of the Academy of History. The *Cadira de honor* is found on the back of twenty of the sheets of the *Tratado de fascinaciones o acojamiento* of Villena. The existence of this MS appears to be not generally known to historians. I have found it mentioned only by Menéndez y Pelayo, *Antología*, V, cccxviii; Paz y Melia, *Obras*, p. 384; and Amador de los Ríos, *Historia crítica de la literatura española*, VI, 264 ff. E. Cotarelo y Mori, *Don Enrique de Villena*, p. 100, n. 2, mentions the MS of the *Triunfo de las donas* ascribed to Villena, but not the *Cadira de honor*. While Ticknor, *History of Spanish Literature*, does not mention this work, he must have been aware of its existence, inasmuch as he credits Don Enrique de Villena with having alluded to Macías in his writings (p. 365). Both Menéndez y Pelayo and Amador de los Ríos agree that the *Cadira de honor* must rightly be considered the work of Juan Rodríguez del Padrón.

siones de amor belongs to a class of works frequently found in the *Cancioneros*, liturgical parodies. As can be seen from the title, it applies the idea of the nine "lessons of Job" to profane love. In the early part of the work, Macías is thus mentioned:

Mando, si por bien touiere
de pagar mas los seruicios
que serui,
que me entierren do quisiere,
y el responso y los officios
diga assi:

"Tu que mataste a Macías
de enamorada memoria,
a este que su victoria
le vencio y todos sus dias,
su pena touo por gloria."⁴³

The *Siete gozos de amor* of Rodríguez de la Cámara, already mentioned, is a similar work, wherein the familiar "gozos de la Virgen" are parodied.

In the *Cancionero de Herberay* there are two other works that mention Macías. The first is a short poem by Juan Pimentel, Conde de Mayorga.⁴³ It runs thus:

Quando tú a mi oyas
Dar voces que me quemaua,
Sabete que maquexaua
El dolor que a Macías.

Yo me veo assi llegado
En esta mortal foguera,
Que no sé en qual manera
Della pueda ser apartado.
Saluo por causa de ti
Que saluar a mí podrias,
E sino te plaze assi,
Sabe te que en mis dias
A morir torna Macías.⁴⁴

⁴³ *Cancionero castellano del siglo XV*, II, 624.

⁴⁴ He was the son of the Conde de Benavente mentioned in note 25, above. He died in 1437. In the *Cancionero de [la Condesa de] Castañeda*, edited by D. Francisco R. de Uhagón as *Un cancionero del siglo XV* (Madrid, 1900), pp. 32-33, there is a composition of Pedro de Escavias, entitled *Coplas que fizo a Pero de Guzman sobre la muerte del Conde de Mayorga*.

⁴⁵ Gallardo, *Ensayo*, Vol. I, col. 527.

The other composition is the one assigned to Madama Lucrecia, la Napoletana.⁴⁵ The fifth stanza follows:

A Macias alabar
Oy de buen amador,
Mas non se deue nombrar
En el honesto amar;
Ca juntamente refrena
Su desseo e potencia
Con la honesta cadena
Que le da gloria e pena
Por vsar de continencia.⁴⁶

Fray Iñigo de Mendoza,⁴⁷ one of the favorite poets of Isabella the Catholic, alludes to Macías in his *Vita Christi*. It consists of four hundred and ten *coplas*; but despite its great length it reached only to the Slaughter of the Innocents, remaining unfinished. Its length is due largely to the numerous digressions with which the narration is interrupted. One of these satirical passages contains the following words:

Su dançar, su festejar,
sus gastos, justas y galas,
su trobar, su cartear,
su trabajar, su tentar
de noche con las escalas,
su morir noches y dias
para ser dellas bien quistos,
sy lo vieses, jurarias
que por el dios de Macias
venderan mill Jhesus Christos.⁴⁸

The following allusions are drawn from the *Cancionero general de Castillo*, which was first compiled in 1511. The first is a short com-

⁴⁵ An examination of this composition reveals, as Rennert has pointed out (*Macias*, p. 61), that it was addressed to rather than written by Lucrecia, who is undoubtedly the Lucrecia di Alagna (or Alania, Aniano, Alañó, as various writers have it) who was the mistress of Alfonso V, "Rey Magnánimo" of Naples. The actual author of the poem may possibly have been Juan de Tapia or Juan de Andájar, for both of them belonged to King Alfonso's literary court and both celebrated Lucrecia in various known poems. It was probably written between 1450 and 1458, the time during which the king enjoyed Lucrecia's favor. Cf. Amador de los Ríos, *Historia crítica de la literatura española*, VI, 482 and note.

⁴⁶ Gallardo, *Ensayo*, Vol. I, col. 463.

⁴⁷ We know very little concerning Fray Iñigo de Mendoza. As far as is known, he was not related to his namesake, Iñigo de Mendoza, the Marqués de Santillana. It is quite likely that he may have been a converted Jew and have taken this name on his conversion. See Menéndez y Pelayo, *Antología*, VI, celi ff.

⁴⁸ *Cancionero castellano del siglo XV*, I, 46.

position ascribed to Tapia,⁴⁹ beginning *Allá en la guerra Anibal*.⁵⁰ The first stanza of four is as follows:

Allá en la guerra Anibal,
en la paz acá Macías,
pues que yo sé que soys tal,
quiero que sepays mi mal
aunqu'es mal de muchos dias:
yo me quemo d'una llama
qu'es vn fuego que se llama
muy peor que d'alquitrán,
por amores, segun fama,
de la más hermosa dama
de todas las de Ampurdan.⁵¹

Rodrigo Cota⁵² mentions Macías in his *Diálogo entre el Amor y un viejo*. Love meets the old man in a garden. The latter immediately accuses Love of being responsible for many of the ills of man, and congratulates himself on not being in his clutches. The old man soon yields, however, to Love's blandishments. In the tone of passing a sentence, Love says:

Y sabe que te reuelo
vna dolorida nueua,
do sabras como se ceua
quien se mete en mi señuelo.
Amaras mas que Macías,
hallaras esquiuidad,
sentiras las plagas mias,
fenescean tus viejos dias
en ciega catiuidad.⁵³

⁴⁹ This Tapia is thought to be distinct from the Juan de Tapia of the court of Alfonso V and the *Cancionero de Stúñiga*. In the *Cancionero general* he is credited with sixty compositions. Among them are some celebrating events of date later than Juan de Tapia is thought to have lived. There is, for instance, an epitaph to Caesar Borgia (1476-1507). Cf. Menéndez y Pelayo, *Antología*, VI, ccxxvi and note.

⁵⁰ The heading of this poem, which gives a good idea of its nature, is as follows: "Coplas suyas á un amigo suyo que quería partir á la guerra de Ampurdan, el qual le preguntó que si tenía su amiga en aquella tierra, porque él aula estado allá algun tiempo, que le dixiese quién era, y que la serviria por él; y él responde en estas coplas y dále las señas en qué la conosca."

⁵¹ *Cancionero general de Castillo* (Madrid, 1882), II, 60.

⁵² Rodrigo Cota de Maguaque flourished during the latter half of the fifteenth century. For excellent accounts of him, see Cotarelo y Mori's articles in *Boletín de la Real Academia Española*, XIII (1926), 11-17 and 140-43, and Augusto Cortina, "Rodrigo Cota," in *Revista de la Biblioteca, Archivo y Museo*, VI (1929), 151-65.

⁵³ *Cancionero general de Castillo*, I, 306-7.

The last of the works alluding to Macías from this *Cancionero* is a poem of seven stanzas by the Comendador Estúñiga.⁵⁴ The first *copla* runs thus:

Los años y meses, semanas y días,
las horas, momentos, y muy chicos puntos,
yo hallo conmigo trabajos tan juntos,
que hago ventajas al santo Macías.
Trabaja mi seso con tristes porfías
que nascen contino de mis pensamientos;
trabajan mi cuerpo crueles tormentos,
prouando sus fuerças, quitando las mias.⁵⁵

Among the Portuguese, Macías enjoyed probably even greater fame than in Spain. In the *Cancioneiro geral de García de Resende*,⁵⁶ first published in Lisbon in 1516, there are almost as many allusions as we have thus far discussed. Of the numerous poets represented in this *Cancioneiro*, many were bilingual.⁵⁷ Though we cannot examine all of these allusions, it will be well to note a few of them. We find the name of Macías employed at times with the force of a common noun, signifying, of course, a lover par excellence. Thus the following stanza

⁵⁴ The heading reads: "Porque vnas damas le dixerón qué sintía en sí." This Comendador Estúñiga, by whom there are five compositions in the *Cancionero general*, is not easily identified. He might possibly be the same as the Lope de Stúñiga, or Estúñiga, after whom the *Cancionero de Stúñiga* is called, for no more valid reason than that the first two works of the collection are his. This latter was Comendador de Guadalcanal. A significant fact is that the foregoing composition is written in the *verso de arte mayor*, popularized by Juan de Mena, especially in his *Laberinto de fortuna*. Only ten of the approximately one hundred and fifty known and many unidentified writers of the *Cancionero general* essayed this meter, but this serves as no clue. None of the other works attributed to any of the several Estúñigas is in this meter. The other four compositions of the Comendador, however, are very much in the usual erotic vein of the works of Lope de Stúñiga.

⁵⁵ *Cancionero general de Castillo*, II, 205.

⁵⁶ Ed. E. H. v. Kausler (3 vols.; Stuttgart, 1846-52). After the original date of publication, the *Cancioneiro de Resende* was not republished until the present edition. This is a literal copy of the first, all of its many errors included. García de Resende was a chamberlain of the kings Don Juan II and Don Manuel, whose reigns extended from 1481 to 1521. For a discussion of this collection, see Juan Valera, *Crítica literaria (1887-89)* (Madrid, n.d.), XXVII, 241-58.

⁵⁷ This *Cancioneiro* presents a rather undigested mass of material, and historians differ widely as to the number of poets represented. J. Cejador y Frauca, *Historia*, I, 293, together with Menéndez y Pelayo, *Antología*, VII, cv, says that it contains compositions of one hundred and fifty poets, of which number forty-one write in Spanish, while Hurtado y de la Serna, *Historia*, I, 214, estimates these figures respectively at two hundred and eighty-six and twenty-nine. E. Mérimée, *Précis d'histoire de la littérature espagnole* (Paris, 1922), p. 123, says that it contains poems of two hundred and fifty-seven Portuguese, in addition to those of twenty-nine who wrote in Castilian. S. G. Morley, in his translation and revision of Mérimée's work, *A History of Spanish Literature* (New York, 1930), pp. 102-3, makes the number who wrote in Castilian "more than sixty," of which number, he says, twenty-nine were actually Spaniards.

taken from the poem *Trouas do Coudel Moor a Fernam Cabral vindo da corte*.⁵⁸

Myçer gualante Cabral,
boas nouas deos vos mande,
soys em corte feo grande
& no campo outro tal.
Huum Mançias soys segundo
por seruyr damas tornado,
& dos galantes soys dado
por espelho neste mundo [I, 159].

Also this, by the same author:

Diraa senhora de Sousa:
"era este mall logrado,
huum Mançias" [II, 14].

In folios 1-15c is an unusually interesting composition, under the general title of *O cuydar & sospirar*, in which Macías plays a considerable part both in allusions and otherwise.⁵⁹ The subhead reads: "Pregunta que fez Jorge da Silueyra a Nuno Pereira, porque hyndo ambos por hum caminho, vynha Nuno Pereyra *muyto cuydoso*, & Jorge da Silueyra d'outra parte, dando *muytos sospiros*, sendo ambos seruidores da senhora dona Lyanor da Silua."

Jorge da Silueyra and Nuno Pereyra begin a discussion of the relative merits of *cuydar* and *sospirar*—that is, in the eyes of their beloved. Since both are serving the same lady, each wishes to prove that his way of expressing his love is the better. Together they immediately appeal to the lady herself for a decision, but she orders them to enlist the aid of others to plead their cases. Various contemporary poets are then introduced to uphold one or the other side of the question. The argument becomes heated. On the part of *cuydar*, Nuno Pereyra thus speaks, invoking the memory both of Macías and of Narcissus:

Narçiso, Mançias morrerão,
de soo cuydados vençydos,

⁵⁸ *Coudel Moor* is the title by which Fernán Silveira is usually known. The title serves in a way to distinguish him from the other Silveiras whose compositions are contained in the *Cancioneiro de Resende*.

⁵⁹ This composition extends to page 107 in the edition at hand, and is composed of three hundred and forty-two *coplas*. There is a heading to every second or third stanza on the average, which considerably lengthens the work.

ho quantos ensandecerão
 muy sesudos, que perderão
 com cuydados seus sentydos¹⁶⁰ [I, 7]

And against this argument the *Coudel Moor* replies:

Uos, cunhado, qu'alegastes
 Narçiso, tambem Mançyas,
 nam sey, u lhe vos achastes,
 ou como cuydar cuydastes,
 que fez acabar seus dias.
 Mas tu, sospirar, que cortas
 alma, bofes, antredanhas,
 nam alegas com estranhas
 testamunhas que sam mortas! [I, 14]

Finally, when the lady has heard the witnesses to her heart's content, she gives her judgment. It is signally in favor of *sospirar*. Her preference is based on the fact that

... cuydado em lugar
 pode estar sem sospirar,
 assy como esta prouado;
 sospirar nam sser achado
 sem este mesmo cuydar [I, 77].

Following this sentence, come still other *copras* in which Macías, Juan de Mena, Rodríguez de la Cámara, and Tarquin speak at length on the merits of *cuydar*. Their words are evidently supposed to carry more authority than those of the contemporaries. The speech of Macías, in part, is as follows:

Sospiros & sospirar,
 mesajões d'atrebulado,
 o meu mal podem mostrar;
 mas nam me podem matar,
 como me mata cuydado [I, 84].

The others also speak against the sentence that has been pronounced. In the end, the God of Love himself is constrained to reverse the decision, so that *cuydar* remains triumphant.

Juan de Meneses and Juan Manuel each analyzes, in a poem, his

¹⁶⁰ According to the medieval viewpoint, to die for love of one's lady, or even to lose one's senses, was practically to attain amatory perfection. Cf. Juan Rodríguez del Padrón's *Ham, ham, huyd, que ravia* (*Cancionero de Castillo*, No. 166), where the author pretends to have become as a mad dog because of his love.

emotions on taking leave of his beloved and finds that his love and suffering exceeds that of Macías.⁶¹ Thus:

Polo qual sem esperar
de vos ver mais em meus dias,
como quem se ve matar,
deixo jsto por lembrar,
que me nam chegou Mançias
Em amar, nem em querer,
com quanto teue gram fama,
sem se nunca desdizer,
& depois triste morrer
por amor de sua dama [I, 122].

And:

O alma mya aflegida,
de quantas penas te dy
porque no partes de my,
pues de ty partio tu vida!
Dexa-me, pues te dexo
todo quanto bien tenyas,
y mas rrazon te mato
que a Mançias [I, 411-12].

One of the best poems of this collection is that of Antonio Mendez, on the following words: *Cogitavi dies antiquos, et annos eternos in mente habui*. One of the six stanzas of the work is as follows:

Cuydey nos antigos dias
do tempo que he ja mudado,
vy meu bem todo tornado
em chorar como Mançyas
a memorea do passado.
Chorey ho mal que padeçeo,
chorey ho bem que passou,
vy meu tempo, qu'acabou
& deyxou-me no começo
dos males que m'ordenou⁶² [III, 457].

From the fifteenth century on, the memory of Macías has been perpetuated by many other writers in addition to those here dis-

⁶¹ *De dom Joam de Meneses a sua dama em huma partida, sendo moço and Coplas suyas* [of Don Juan Manuel] *partindo sua dama donde elle estava*. Juan de Meneses was major-domo of the two kings Don Juan II and Don Manuel; Juan Manuel was a bastard son of the Obispo de Guarda and a grandson of King Duarte. Cf. Cejador y Frauca, *Historia*, I, 90.

⁶² Further allusions to Macías in the *Cancioneiro de Resende* are to be found in the following places: I, 46, 80, 84, 178, 382, and 384; II, 43, 327, and 516; and III, 412 and 537.

cussed. The Bachiller Juan de San Pedro and García de Pedraza allude to him in poems. Camoëns, among the later Portuguese, refers to him both in his *Redondilhas* and in his *Auto de Filodemo*. Hugo Bernat de Rocaberti, in his *Comedia de la gloria de amor*, places Macías alongside Cabestanh, the great Aragonese martyr of love. If we are to credit the assumptions of Joseph de Perott, the fame of Macías has extended even to the English stage.⁶³ Lope de Vega makes him the subject of his *Porfiar hasta morir*, one of his better dramas. "Tres Ingenios" of a slightly later period composed a drama entitled *El español más amante y desgraciado Macías*, which is largely a reworking of Lope's play, with a few rather puerile details added.⁶⁴ As Menéndez y Pelayo has well remarked, we could not have expected Macías to appear during the artistically glacial eighteenth century.⁶⁵ The most recent detailed treatment of the legend is that of Mariano José de Larra (1809-37) in his drama *Macías* and his historical novel *El doncel de don Enrique el Doliente*. All of these later treatments follow rather closely the version of the legend originally outlined by Argote de Molina. Lack of space prevents a discussion of these works.

One point remains to be discussed—the changing attitude toward Macías during the *Siglo de Oro*. During the fifteenth century, the allusions seemed almost universally to be of a wholly serious nature. Now, however, many of them show an opposite tendency. The *Infierno* type of literary composition has lost its former popularity, and with it the type of lover whose fame it celebrated.⁶⁶

Several allusions of this nature are to be found among the *Romances* of Luis de Góngora y Argote (1561-1627). In *Romance XLVII* some hack horses are represented as speaking to each other and

⁶³ "Macías sur la scène anglaise en 1580," in *Revue germanique*, X (1914), 69.

⁶⁴ One of these "Ingenios" is generally recognized as being Francisco Antonio de Bances y López-Candamo (1662-1704), but the other two are unknown.

⁶⁵ *Observaciones preliminares*, p. lvii.

⁶⁶ Cristóbal de Castillejo (ca. 1490-1556), the famous enemy of all Italian influence and imitation, has written a poem, entitled *Contra los encarecimientos de las coplas españolas que tratan de amores* (*Poetas líricos de los siglos XVI y XVII*, Vol. XXXII of "B. A. E." [Madrid, 1921], p. 156), which indicates a changing attitude. He complains of

"Garcí-Sánchez y otros ciento
Muy gentiles caballeros,
Que por esos cancioneros
Echan suspiros al viento."

complaining of their masters. Part of the speech of the first is as follows:

Sirvo, les dijo, a un ratiño,
Macías enamorado,
Tan flaco en las carnes él.
Como yo en las carnes flaco.⁶⁷

Also, in *Romances LX* and *LXIV* we find the two following similar allusions:

Dejad caminar al triste
Macías o mazacote,
A la ausencia y a los celos
Componiendo un estrambote.⁶⁸

And:

Es enamorado
Tan en demasía,
Que es un mazacote,
¿Qué digo? un Macías.⁶⁹

The device of a deliberate transfer of epithets is employed in *Romance CXI*, where a certain person is described as

Más valiente que Macías,
Más derretido que el Cid,
Más sabido que Roldán,
Más membrudo que Merlín.⁷⁰

Pedro Calderón de la Barca shows the same burlesque tendency in some of the allusions to Macías in his dramas. In *Para vencer á amor, querer vencerle*, for instance, Espolín, a *gracioso*, says the following:

¡Vive Dios! que fue contigo
Macías niño de teta,
Un matamuertos Leandro,
Y Píramo un alzapuertas.⁷¹

KENNETH HALE VANDERFORD

⁶⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 520.

⁶⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 528.

⁶⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 530.

⁷⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 548.

⁷¹ *Las comedias de D. Pedro Calderón de la Barca* (Leipzig, 1829), III, 522.

MIDDLETON'S CIVIC EMPLOYMENTS

THOMAS MIDDLETON'S first connection with civic pageantry occurred quite early in his career. Thomas Dekker designed the entertainment given to James I by the City of London on his official entry into the City on March 15, 1603/4;¹ but the first long speech, that of Zeal, which was delivered by a member of Henslowe's company, for which both dramatists were then working, was not by Dekker, for he acknowledges that "if there be any glory to be won by writing these lines, I do freely bestow it, as his due, on Tho. Middleton, in whose brain they were begotten, though they were delivered there: *quæ nos non fecimus ipsi, vix ea nostra voco.*"² So unusual and so handsome an acknowledgment points to an unusual degree of friendship between the two men.

The greater part of Middleton's civic employments belong, however, to the middle part of his career. His dramatic activities from 1610 to 1620 are not traceable with any certainty, but his connection with civic pageantry is fairly constant. By about 1612 he had evidently acquired a definite reputation as a dramatist, and had discovered that he had a turn for the ingenious (but not too ingenious) flattery that tickled the palates of the City Fathers. Middleton could address a Lord Mayor in a dedication with as much unction as if "his lordship" had been a duke, and his civic patronage, once obtained, remained secure until the end of his life. One of his first tasks in the service of the City was to write and superintend the performance of *The Masque of Cupid* at the Merchant Taylors' Hall on January 4, 1613/4. This entertainment was given by the Lord Mayor and aldermen in honor of the marriage of the ill-starred Earl and Countess of Somerset.³

¹ *The Magnificent Entertainment: Given to King James, Queene Anne his wife, and Henry Frederick the Prince, vpon the day of his Maiesties Tryumphant passage (from the Tower) through the Honorable Citie of London, being the 15 of March 1603. By Tho. Dekker. T. C. for Tho. Man the yonger (1604).*

² *The Works of Middleton*, ed. Bullen, VII, 226.

³ This masque is not extant; all that is known of it is from Howe's account of the celebrations in his continuation of Stowe's *Annals*, and from the allowance of expenses to Middleton entered in the *Repertory of the City of London* (Vol. XXXI, Part II, fol. 239v). See Dyce's edition of Middleton, I, xix-xx, where the relevant extracts are printed in full.

[MODERN PHILOLOGY, August, 1933]

Two or three months before *The Masque of Cupid*, Middleton had designed his first mayoral show, *The Triumphs of Truth*, in honor of his namesake, Sir Thomas Middleton. His employment so soon afterward to write the *Masque* indicates that his pageant had given as much satisfaction to the Lord Mayor as it gave offense to Chapman, who, in the dedicatory epistle to his translation of the *Odyssey*, very justly censured it for its effusive laudations: "Why then is fiction to this end so hateful to our true ignorants? or why should a poor chronicler of a *Lord Mayor's naked Truth* (that peradventure will last his year) include more worth with our modern wizards than Homer for his naked Ulysses clad in eternal fiction?" Henceforth Middleton was frequently employed as the designer of mayoral pageants. His first pageant had been *The Triumphs of Truth*, and in the years following he proceeded to exhaust the civic virtues. In 1617 Honour and Industry triumphed, and in 1619 Love and Antiquity; in 1621 came *The Sun in Aries*, the only variation from his regular formula for the title. *The Triumphs of Honour and Virtue* followed in 1622; Integrity was his theme in 1623, and, having exhausted all the virtues, he had to be content to celebrate Wealth and Prosperity in 1626.

Other similar employments followed in the wake of these pageants, which were arranged by the Company to which the Lord Mayor elect belonged. In 1616 Middleton designed *Civitas amor . . . : An Entertainment by Water*, performed at the expense of the City to celebrate the creation of Charles as Prince of Wales.⁴ A masque for the entertainment at the Inner Temple on New Year's Day, 1619, followed. In 1619 also he wrote, in collaboration with Rowley, *The World Tossed at Tennis*, a masque intended for performance at the Court itself. In 1620 Middleton's connection with the City of London became an official one, for on September 6 he was appointed City Chronologer. Evidently he had petitioned the Court of Aldermen for the post; and, on hearing the petition, the Court, "upon consideration thereof taken, and upon sufficient testimony this Court hath received of his services

⁴ The following entry refers to this entertainment (December 10, 1616): "Item it is ordred by this court that M^r Chamberlain shalbe allowed vpon his accompts the some of cccxxliij^{li} li^s vi^d by him disbursed for the shewes vpon the water, and other chardges in meeting Prince Charles at Chelsey the xxixth of October last coming to his creacon at Westminster his highnes being attended by the Lord Maior and Aldermen and the sewall Companies of this Cittle" (*Repertory*, Vol. XXXV, fol. 18).

performed to this City," was "well pleased to entertain and admit the said Thomas Middleton to collect and set down all memorable acts of this City and occurrences thereof, and for such other employments as this Court shall have occasion to use him in."⁵ The salary of the office was to be £6/13/4 a year, but on January 23, 1620/1, it was raised to £10.⁶ During the next few years there are frequent notices of grants made to Middleton by the Court of Aldermen. On September 17, 1622, he was given £15, on the following February 5, £20, and on September 2, 1623, "for and towards the charges of the service latelie performed by him att the shutting at Bunhill before the Lord Maior and Aldermen," the sum of M. 20. Another type of reward that was sometimes given was "the nominacion and benefitt of one persone to be made free of this Cittye by redempcion, the same persone beinge firste presented and allowed of by this Court"; it is not known what this right of nomination was worth to Middleton, but it was granted to him on April 17, 1621; May 7, 1622; and April 24, 1623.

The nature of the other employments "such as this Court shall have occasion to use him in," mentioned in the terms of Middleton's appointment, is made clear by the *Invention*,⁷ preserved among the State Papers, which was given at a Lord Mayor's feast in 1622, and by the *Honorable Entertainments, Compos'de for the Seruice of this Noble Citie* (1621), known only from the unique copy in the Henry E. Huntington Library. It is no wonder that Ben Jonson, who succeeded Middleton in the office of City Chronologer, was a bad chronologer and was contemptuous of the man who was a good one, for, as his latest editors say:⁸

Jonson's views on such performances might be guessed, even if he had not written the *Speech according to Horace* (Underwoods xlv) in which he writes

⁵ *Ibid.*, Vol. XXXIV, fol. 540v, printed in the *Analytical Index to the "Remembrancia" of the City of London*, p. 305 n.

⁶ The date is wrongly given as November 20, 1620, in the *Analytical Index to the "Remembrancia"*, but it is correctly given by Dyce (I, xxiii), who prints in full all the passages referring to Middleton except those of September 6, 1620, and May 7, 1622, the last of which has not previously been noticed.

⁷ An *Invention performed for the service of ye Right honorable Edward Barkham, L. Mayor of the Cittie of London*, MS in the handwriting of Ralph Crane preserved in Vol. CXXIX of the State Papers (Domestic) of the reign of James I.

⁸ *The Works of Ben Jonson*, ed. Simpson and Herford, I, 241 n.

with scathing irony of the City and "the battells of thy Aldermanitie," such as the shootings at Bunhill:

In the stead of bold
Beauchamps, and Nevills, Cliffords, Audleys old:
Insert thy Hodges, and these newer men,
As Stiles, Dike, Ditchfield, Millar, Crips and Fen.

That Middleton carried out conscientiously most of his duties as Chronologer is certain; he set down the "memorable acts and occurrences of the City" as readily as he supplied speeches in verse to dignify the festive occasions themselves. His more serious works for the City have disappeared, but they were extant in the first half of the eighteenth century, and Oldys, in a manuscript note in a copy of Langbaine that is preserved in the British Museum, records that "two MSS of this author's . . . were sold in an Auction of Books at the Apollo Coffee House in Fleet Street ab^t the year 1735 by Edw Lewis but puffd up to a great price, bought back, and could not afterw^ds be recovered. They were entitled I. *Annales: or a Continuation of Chronologie; conteyninge Passages and Occurrences proper to the Hono^{ble} City of London; Beginninge in the Yeare of our Lorde 1620 . . . and II. Middleton's Farrago*"—a collection of notes on political events.

The Lord Mayors' shows of the early seventeenth century were organized by the company to which the Lord Mayor elect belonged, in order to celebrate the elevation of one of their number to the highest civic dignity. The expenses of the celebrations were met by a levy on the members of the company, and this levy was sufficiently burdensome to cause citizens to speak of an unexpected outlay as being "as chargeable as the morrow after Simon and Jude."⁹ Payment, however, was strictly enforced, and measures were taken against those who did not pay their contributions promptly.¹⁰ The arrangements for the show were in the hands of a committee, chosen from the mem-

⁹ Middleton, *Anything for a Quiet Life*, I, 1, 73-74. According to the accounts of the Grocers' Company for the pageant of 1613, bachelors in foyne were assessed at £8, and bachelors in budge at £5. The ordinary yeomen of the company paid considerably less.

¹⁰ The accounts of the Grocers' Company for the pageant of 1622 contain a payment of £3 to the Lord Mayor's officers for proceeding against "such as would not pay as they were assessed."

bers of the company,¹¹ but most of the organization was carried out by the man appointed to design the pageantry of the procession.

On the day after he entered into office (October 29), the new Lord Mayor went in state to Westminster to take the oath in the presence of the Lord Chief Justice. The procession went from the Guildhall to the river, and there took barges to Westminster. The Lord Mayor, in his barge, was followed by the barges of the great liveried companies; peals of ordnance were fired from both sides of the river at his going and on his return,¹² and a galley-foist attended, to fire salutes and to provide martial music on the journey. On returning from Westminster by water, the Lord Mayor landed at Baynard's Castle and proceeded directly to Paul's Yard, where some of the principal pageants¹³ were stationed, and there listened to various congratulatory speeches. Leaving Paul's at the northwest corner, the procession passed down Cheapside, halting at the Little Standard and the Cross in Cheap, where other pageants were generally stationed, and turned down St. Lawrence's Lane to enter the Guildhall. The Lord Mayor and his guests then dined in state, though Middleton, in defiance of popular prejudice, expressed a belief that the banquet was distinguished by the temperate restraint of the diners no less than by its elegance.¹⁴ After dinner the Lord Mayor, attended by the whole of the procession, went to a service at St. Paul's, and at the close of the day was eventually escorted home in full state. Such, in brief, were the ceremonies that marked the installation of the new Lord Mayor. The processional character of the whole proceedings cannot be overstressed, and the slim booklets¹⁵ written by Middleton to describe the shows he designed and wrote speeches for give an account of but a part of the celebrations. To obtain a complete conception of the whole procession it is

¹¹ The accounts of the Grocers' Company for the pageant of 1622 record a payment of £4 "in benevolence to George Lovett, Paynter, for his paines in drawinge a proiect for this busynes which was offered to the Comittee."

¹² "Six score chambers twice shot off viz 80 at the Standgate 40 at the Banke Syde. £30." (Item in the accounts of the Grocers' Company pageant of 1613).

¹³ The word "pageant" is here used in the medieval sense.

¹⁴ Bullen's edition of Middleton, VII, 305.

¹⁵ The descriptions of the pageants were printed at the expense of the companies producing them, and were apparently not sold in the ordinary way, but distributed privately by the companies. This fact might account for the present-day rarity of some of these pamphlets. The 1613 and 1617 accounts of the Grocers' Company record payments of £4 "to Nicholas Okes Staconer for the prynting of 500 bookes."

necessary to turn to older descriptions of it, and piece these out with the aid of the accounts of expenditure preserved by the City companies.

The description of the Lord Mayor's show of 1553 in the diary of Henry Machyn¹⁶ is the fullest extant account of any of the sixteenth-century processions, and, fortunately, it emphasizes certain features of the show which are not mentioned in any of Middleton's pamphlets. There seems no reason to doubt that practically all the features mentioned by Machyn were present in the shows of Middleton's time, some eighty years later. Here is Machyn's description:

My Lord Mayor landed at Baynard Castle, and in St. Paul's churchyard every craft were set in array. First were two tall men¹⁷ bearing two great streamers of the Merchant Taylors' arms; then came one with a drum and a flute playing and another with a great fife, all they in blue silk; and then came two great wooded men armed with two great clubs, all in green and with squibs burning, with great beards and side hair, and two targets upon their back. Then came sixteen trumpeters blowing, and then came my Lord Mayor's Company in blue gowns and caps and hose and blue silk sleeves, and every man having a target and a javelin to the number of seventy. Then came a devil and after came the bachelors all in a livery and scarlet hoods; and then came the pageant . . . with goodly speeches. Then came all the King's trumpeters blowing, and every trumpeter having scarlet caps, and the waits caps and goodly banners. And then the crafts, and then the waits playing, and then my Lord Mayor's officers, and then my Lord Mayor and two good henchmen, and then all the aldermen and sheriffs, and so to dinner.

Only once does Middleton, in his accounts of the pageantry at these shows, give us a glimpse of the procession, viz., in *The Triumphs of Love and Antiquity*, when he speaks of "his lordship, accompanied with many noble personages: the honourable fellowship of ancient magistrates and aldermen of the city; the two new Sheriffs, . . . not forgetting the noble puissant loves of the heroic captains of the city, and gentlemen of the Artillery-garden, making with two glorious ranks a manly and majestic passage for their lord-general, his lordship, through Guildhall-Yard; and afterward their loves to his lordship resounding in the second volley."¹⁸ In Middleton's day the pageantry was more elaborate than in Machyn's, and at least one of the pageants

¹⁶ Ed. J. G. Nichols, "Camden Society Publications" (1848), pp. 47-48. I have modernized the spelling and punctuation in the passage quoted.

¹⁷ I.e., greenmen.

¹⁸ Bullen's Ed. of Middleton, VII, 324-25.

usually accompanied the Lord Mayor on the water to Westminster,¹⁹ to be hurried back so as to be in its position in time to meet the Mayor on his progress through the City on the way to the Guildhall. But the main features of the procession of 1553 were essentially the same as those of the processions of James I's reign, and are illustrated in almost every particular by items in the companies' accounts.

Little is said in the accounts of the part taken by the senior members of the company (who would, of course, provide their own robes and discharge any other personal expenses) beyond the fact that the bachelors were given a breakfast before the procession set out. The yeomen and pensioners, however, were liberally provided for, and Machyn's description of "my Lord Mayor's Company in blue gowns and caps and hose and blue silk sleeves, and every man having a target and a javelin" is confirmed in the Grocers' Company's accounts for the 1613 show by items for the purchase of a hundred and twenty-four gowns and sleeves, for numerous caps, for four new shields, and for the hire of a hundred and thirty javelins. In addition to the bunting which decorated the galley-foist and the pageants, banners were carried in the procession, and the same accounts record payments for some twenty banners. Thirty-two of the King's trumpeters, the City waits, eight drummers, and four fifers also took part in the procession, as did "two fencers and fifteen fellow flourishers with long swords." Whifflers walked alongside the procession carrying white staves to keep back the press of people, and the same 1613 accounts record the purchase of no less than twenty-nine-dozen staves.

The grotesques were another feature of the procession. Machyn mentions two tall men, a devil, and "two great wooden men armed with two great clubs, all in green, and with squibs burning, with great beards and side hair, and two targets upon their back." The greenmen, or woodmen, were descendants of the leaf-clad figures of the May-games; and the giants, of whom Gog and Magog are the most famous exemplars, and who were often carried in civic processions, were also old folk figures, although there is no mention of giants in any of Middleton's pageants. The devils, who, like the greenmen, carried

¹⁹ *The Triumphs of Love and Antiquity* (1619) is, however, the only one of Middleton's shows in which there was actually a speech delivered on the water.

squibs and fireworks, came from the Miracle plays. Sir Edmund Chambers thinks that "when the Midsummer show came to an end in 1538 the pageants were transferred to the installation procession,"²⁰ and it is more than likely that these grotesque figures came from the same source. Other grotesques introduced into the procession were the animals, which generally pulled the pageants. When a draper was Lord Mayor, "two pelleted lions," the supporters of the company's arms, always figured in the procession. Similarly, in the Grocers' Company's shows, griffins and camels appeared, and the accounts for the show of 1613 record a payment of £3/13/6 for "Nutmegges, Gynger, almonds in the shell and sugar loves, w^{ch} weare thrown about the streetes by those which sate on the Gryffyns and Camels."

The man who designed the pageants did much more than merely plan a few allegorical groups and write half-a-dozen appropriate speeches. The principal item in the Grocers' Company's accounts for the pageant of 1617 makes this clear:

Payde to Thomas Middleton, gent., for the ordering, overseeing and writyng of the whole devyse, for the making of the Pageant of Nations, the Iland, the Indian Chariot, the Castle of Fame, tryming the Shipp, with all the severall beastes w^{ch} drew them, and for all the carpenters work, paynting, guldning, and garnysing of them, with all other things necessary for the apparelling and finding of all the psonages in the sayd shewes, and for all the portage and carriage, both by land and by water, for paynting of a banner of the Lord Mayors armes, and also in full for the greenmen, dyvells and fyerworks with all thinges thereunto belonging according to his agreement the some of 282-00-00.

From this it is apparent that Middleton not merely planned the pageantry, but that he had charge of the execution of all the details, even including the greenmen, the devils, and their fireworks. It is true that in his first venture, the show of 1613, he had the assistance of his more experienced rival, Anthony Munday, of whom he speaks so disparagingly in his descriptions of the pageants.²¹ On that occasion Middleton apparently wrote the speeches, saw to the costumes of the actors, and rehearsed the performance, while Munday concerned him-

²⁰ *The Mediaeval Stage*, II, 65.

²¹ Bullen's ed. of Middleton, VII, 233-34 and 316.

self with the more general problems of arrangement and organization.²² Although this particular partnership does not seem to have been a happy one, Munday was also concerned, in a minor capacity, in the organization of the 1621 and 1623 shows. In 1616 Middleton worked for the first time with Garret Christmas, a "carver," as the accounts term him. Garret Christmas was an exceptionally skilled craftsman who, eventually, was employed regularly to execute all the necessary decorations, and his partnership with Middleton, *parva componere magnis*, parallels that of Inigo Jones with Ben Jonson. Middleton always speaks in the very warmest terms of "the proper beauties of workmanship, the credit of which justly appertains to the deserts of master Garret Christmas, a man excellent in his art, and faithful in his performances."²³

Middleton's descriptions of the pageants he organized are not particularly interesting; neither are his allegories very ingenious, but there was no need that they should be. He rings all the changes of a few well-worn themes: he praises the City, its worthies of the past, its officers, the Lord Mayor, and, most of all, the company from which the Lord Mayor for the year had been chosen. The forms of the pageants varied little from year to year; there was always a magnificent chariot carrying certain allegorical characters, and drawn by strange animals. It might be called the Triumphant Chariot of Love, or the Chariot of Sacred Memory, but, whatever its name, it was a

²² Their shares are thus distinguished in the Grocers' Company's accounts, in which, it will be noticed, there is also a separate item for the carpenter's work:

"Paide to Anthony Monday Gent for the devyse of the Pageant and other shewes and for the appareling & fynding of all the psonages in the sayd shewes (excepting the Pageant) and alsoe for the Portage & carrying both by land and by water . . . 149-00-00.

"Paide to Thomas Middleton Gent for the ordering overseeing & wryting of the whole devyse & alsoe for the appareling the psonages in the Pageant the some of . . . 040-00-00.

"Paide to Grynkin Paynter for the making of the Pageant, Senate house, Shipp errors & truths Charyotts wth all the severall beasts w^{ch} drew thē The five llands, & for all the Carpenters worke, guilding & garnishing of them wth all other necessarye ready for the children & Players to sytt in & alsoe in full for the greenmen, divells & fyre works wth all things thereunto belonging, according to his agreement the some of . . . 310-00-00."

As a rule, however, all these items appeared as one, even where more than one man was concerned, as in the Grocers' Company's accounts for the show of 1622 or the Drapers' Company's accounts for the show of 1621:

"Item paid to Mr. Thomas Middleton Garret Christmas, and Anthony Munday by Agreement for makinge and settinge out of the Pageantes and shewes viz: The one in forme of likeness of a Mountaine one other of a fountaine, with a triple Crowne; a third called the tower of vertue or y^e brazen tower; and the fowrth a Charriot drawne with two pelitted lyons: and for all Chardges incident to those shewes . . . cxlii."

(Taken from A. H. Johnson, *History of the Drapers' Company*, III, 10, n. 3.)

²³ Bullen's edition of Middleton, VII, 350.

regular feature of the procession. Furthermore, there was almost always an ambitious attempt at a landscape effect, either an island or a mountain, and in the different shows we find such pageants as the Five Islands, the Continent of India, a Wilderness, a Beautiful Hill, and London's Triumphant Mount. Pageants of a castle or tower, such as the Castle of Fame and the Tower of Virtue, or Brazen Tower, were fairly common, and occasionally there were special features such as the Triple-crowned Fountain of Justice, the Crystal Sanctuary, and the Globe of Honour. As each procession needed but four or, at the most, five pageants, it will be seen that Middleton did little more than give a new name and a new application to the familiar and well-established features of the procession. Yet even here he had to move within narrow limits, for there were several themes a civic poet could not afford to neglect. Middleton always praised the Lord Mayor in the pageant that took its name from the title of the show, and he praised the City and its government in such pageants as London's Triumphant Mount and the Pageant of Nations. One pageant was always introduced to contain a reference to the company whose munificence provided the show: the pageants of the Five Islands, the Indian Chariot, and the Continent of India all celebrated the trade of the Grocers' Company with the East; Jason, the winner of the Golden Fleece, is introduced into two shows by way of compliment to the Drapers' Company, and a Wilderness, containing Orpheus leading all the beasts that bore fur, did honor to the trade of the Skinners. The deceased worthies of the Company, whose banners were always displayed, were regularly celebrated in a pageant which was usually the pageant of Fame or Honor, and, like as not, Antiquity would come forward to discourse on their merits. Thus, in designing these shows, Middleton had to confine himself within well-prescribed limits, and there seems to be little doubt that he came to perform these duties as a perfunctory task.

Any serious artistic achievement in these shows was prevented not merely by the prescribed themes but by the fact that it was impossible to regard the show as a whole. The pageants were isolated, and brief speeches were delivered from each as the Lord Mayor passed its station, after which it took its place in the procession to be displayed to the gaping crowds. In his first and most elaborate show, *The Triumphs of Truth*, Middleton attempted a sustained allegory in the struggles

between Truth and Error in their chariots, but it must have been quite unintelligible to any except the Lord Mayor and those beside him, and the attempt was never repeated. Lavish display was the prime requisite in these processions; the speeches were an elegant decoration palatable to the City Fathers, but inaudible to most of the spectators. In the sums of money spent on the shows the Grocers' Company stood out; the least expensive of the three which Middleton supervised for them cost more than any of those he designed for the other companies, and the first and most expensive show, that which celebrated his namesake Sir Thomas Middleton, cost over £1,200. But the obvious pride with which Middleton wrote and designed his first show in 1613 did not endure, and his last show, that written in 1626 for the Drapers' Company,²⁴ was conspicuous for being badly organized, and it was only with difficulty that he secured payment on account of the "ill performance thereof."²⁵

This was not the only time Middleton got into trouble. Plans had been made about the middle of 1625 for an elaborate welcome into the City for Charles I and his newly married bride.²⁶ Triumphal arches were erected, and the pageantry was all ready, but the outbreak of the plague first postponed the ceremonies, and finally caused them to be abandoned. In January, 1626, the Court of Aldermen resolved that "upon informaçon given unto this Court . . . of abuses and badd workmanship in and about the contrivings and payntings of the Pageants" certain men should be appointed "to view the Pageants and also the Crosse in Cheape, and the work done in the Exchange, and

²⁴ It is perhaps worth mentioning that A. H. Johnson in his *History of the Drapers' Company*, III, 10, n. 3, states that Middleton entered the company by redemption in 1626, but this is incorrect. Reference to the book containing the admissions of freemen shows that the Thomas Middleton who was admitted in 1626 is described as "filius Richi," and is therefore not the dramatist, whose father's name was William.

²⁵ "Mr. Middleton & Mr Christmas referred to the Wardens for their demaundes touching the pageants."

(Taken from *Repertory*, fol. 202, under the date of December 31, 1626.)

"Item the paymente of Mr Middleton and Mr Christmas for the pageants and of others for the fireworks and providinge of Chambers being hetherto putt of in regarde of the ill performance thereof is now referred to the wardens."

²⁶ Middleton's one earlier piece of pageantry undertaken on behalf of the City in honor of a royal personage, *Civitalis amor* (1619), written for the creation of Charles as Prince of Wales, is a very slight affair. It consists of some speeches between Neptune and London delivered on the water as the barges came down from Chelsea, and a speech by Hope with a song by Peace at the landing-stage at Westminster. The rest of the pamphlet, describing the inauguration ceremonies, is probably not by Middleton.

sufficientlie to inform themselves of the abuses any waie comitted in and about the workmanship thereof." Eventually it was decided, on June 8, that "Mr. Christmas and Mr. Middleton referring themselves to this Court, noe further moneys shalbe paid unto either of them, but that Mr. Christmas shall forthwith cause the said Pageants to bee taken downe, and to have the same for his full satisfaccon."²⁷ The two charges, coming so close together, seem to point to some sort of speculation; whether Middleton and Christmas, having control of the expenditure of the money, spent as little as possible so that there would be the more left over for them, or whether they entered into a profit-sharing agreement with the contractors, cannot, of course, be known. In either case, however, the ending is a sad falling-off from the evident enthusiasm with which Middleton entered upon his civic employments.

Middleton's pen was given another species of employment in the service of the City. Twelve "entertainments" survive: the speech at the opening of the New River in 1612 (appended to *The Triumphs of Truth*), the *Invention* for the feast at Edward Barkham's house during the Easter of 1622, and the ten pieces contained in the *Honorable Entertainments*. Four of these are merely speeches, of welcome and gratulation, delivered in the open air at some civil ceremony such as the shooting at Bunhill; the other eight were written to grace some civic banquet, when the Lord Mayor feasted his own company, or the Mayor and sheriffs entertained the Privy Council. In style the speeches resemble those delivered from the pageants in the shows; they are merely moralizing and complimentary. The entertainments are lighter and more graceful, as befitted the convivial occasions for which they were composed, although they show that the influence of the old Morality plays was not yet entirely extinct. That given at the feat of Sir Francis Jones "to his Owne Noble Fraternitie, the Company of Haberdashers," is interesting because Comus, "the great Sir of Feasts," is the speaker. The next entertainment, written for a Christmas banquet, contains a debate between Levity and Severity, who are both forced to give place to Temperance, and concludes

²⁷ See R. Withington, *English Pageantry*, I, 234-35, and *Repertory*, Vol. XL, fols. 84 and 256.

with a charming song in which Delight is called up, and is answered all the way through her song by Echo. The next entertainment, "for the solemn feast of Easter last, upon the Time of that blessed and laudable Custome of Celebrating the memory of Pious workes in this cittie, at Saint Mary Spittle," is the most successful of all; there is no hint of the morality in it, and for once Middleton has almost conjured up the true spirit of the masque for his civic patrons. The four Seasons, from separate windows, sing a song to summon Flora, who rises in her bower, attended by Hyacinth and Adonis, and addresses the feasters. The Seasons then sing a song of welcome, and Flora sends forth her attendants to greet the guests. It is a slight piece, though the most elaborate of these entertainments, but it is infused throughout with a lyric grace that is quite unexpected in Middleton. The Song of Flowers, the second of the two songs sung by the Seasons, at least merits quotation:

SPRING: Welcome, O welcome, Queene of sweetnes welcome
in the noblest manner,
With all thy *Flowers*, thy sweete breath't
Maids of Honour,

SUMMER: *Flower* gentle! I begin with thee

AUTUMN: *Fayre Flower* of Chrystall! that's for thee.

SPRING: *Apples of Love!* there sweetnesse dwels;

WINTER: Puh, give me *Canterbury Bels*;

SPRING: *Faire double-Gold cups*, griefes expelling,

SUMMER: *Agnus Castus*, all excelleng,

AUTUMN: *Venus Bath!* the loveliest pride of *Iune*,

WINTER: Give me that *Flower*, cald, Go to bed at noone.

SPRING: *Blessed Thistle*, fam'd for good,

SUMMER: *Shepherds Pouch*, for Stanching blood,

AUTUMN: *Faire yellow Knight-wort*, for a foule relapse,

WINTER: And *Ladies-Mantle*, good for Maydens Paps.

SPRING: Tuft *Hyacinth!* that crownes the Bower,

Cal'd of some, the Virgin Flower

WINTER: Take that for me, more good I feele

In *Ruffling Robin*, and *Larkes Heele*.

SPRING: There is a *Sweete*, Vnnamed yet,

The root is white,

The Marke of pure Delight,

Rearing his *Flowers* faire and hie,
The colour like a purple Dye:

WINTER: What is the name tis blest withall?

SPRING: *Live-long!* it so the Shepheards call;

WINTER: *Live-long?* tis *Vertues* promised Due

And may it *long* remain with *You*

Honor'd Patrons

Vertuous Matrons

Whose Lives and Acts this *City* graces,

Daily striuing,

And reuiuing

Works worthy your renowne and places.

Here, and here alone, in the course of his *City* employments did Middleton breathe the spirit of poetry into his work.²³

R. C. BALD

UNIVERSITY OF ADELAIDE

SOUTH AUSTRALIA

²³ Acknowledgments are due to the Clerks of the Grocers' and Drapers' Companies for allowing me to consult their records and to the Henry E. Huntington Library for permission to describe the *Honorable Entertainments*.

COLERIDGE'S INDEBTEDNESS TO PALTOCK'S
PETER WILKINS

IN THE vast array of sources assembled for *The Rime of the Ancient Mariner*¹ no mention has been made of a romance which was well known to Coleridge and which had left a remarkable impression upon him.

The Life and Adventures of Peter Wilkins, A Cornishman, by Robert Paltock, was widely current during Coleridge's youth. It had appeared in English editions of 1751, 1783, and 1784. There had been a French translation in 1763 and a German translation in 1767. Scott, Hunt, Lamb, and Southey are said to have been admirers of it.² Southey, in fact, expressed an extraordinary enthusiasm for the winged people of this romance, from which he borrowed his conception of the Glendo-veers in *The Curse of Kehama*.³

There can be no doubt that Coleridge was another admirer of *Peter Wilkins* and that he knew it intimately for a long period. In a conversation only twenty days before his death, he expressed the opinion that the illustrations of Stothard for the 1816 edition had improved the book, and he referred to the story as one which he had formerly planned to imitate:

Peter Wilkins is to my mind a work of uncommon beauty; and yet Stothard's illustrations have added beauties to it. . . . I believe that Robinson Crusoe and Peter Wilkins could only have been written by islanders. No continentalist could have conceived either tale. . . . It would require a very peculiar genius to add another tale, *ejusdem generis*, to Robinson Crusoe and Peter Wilkins. I once projected such a thing; but the difficulty of a pre-occupied ground stopped me. Perhaps La Motte Fouqué might effect something; but I should fear that neither he, nor any other German, could entirely understand what may be called the "desert island" feeling. I would try the mar-

¹ Cf. especially John Livingston Lowes, *The Road to Xanadu* (Boston and New York, 1927). I am greatly indebted to Professor Lowes for stimulating criticism of this paper.

² *The Life and Adventures of Peter Wilkins* (London, 1925), p. 5. All page references in the present paper are to this edition.

³ Henry Weber, *Popular Romances: Consisting of Imaginary Voyages and Travels* (Edinburgh, 1812), p. xxxi.

velous line of Peter Wilkins, if I attempted it, rather than the *real* fiction of Robinson Crusoe.⁴

Coleridge's admiration went much farther than this. Not only did he project a fanciful story (afterward abandoned) which was to express "the desert island feeling"; *The Rime of the Ancient Mariner* shows the influence of Paltock beyond any mistaking.

This influence appears in two ways: (1) in furnishing general suggestions for the narrative; and (2) in affording a good many hints of phraseology and of situation. The general influence, although too elusive to permit of easy demonstration to one who is unfamiliar with the subtle turnings of the "Road to Xanadu," is sufficiently felt by the reader to justify Coleridge's statement of his predilection for "the marvelous line of Peter Wilkins" in fictional writing. The similarities of phraseology and of situation speak for themselves, if the reader makes a sufficient allowance for the poet's extraordinary power of fusing diverse suggestions into his own final expression. It is unreasonable to search *Peter Wilkins* for extended passages of closely parallel statement. Coleridge concentrates in a few lines of verse an idea which meanders through paragraphs of Paltock's prose; more than that, he concentrates in the same lines a stream of memories which derive from other sources entirely. But it is noteworthy that there are in the two compositions many passages which are similar in statement, and that some of the underlying ideas are remarkably similar. It is perhaps worthy of mention that *The Life and Astonishing Adventures of John Daniel*, an imitation which appeared in the same year with *Peter Wilkins*, is quite unlike Coleridge's poem.

The principal parallels of phraseology are outlined below, arranged (with one exception) according to the order in which the passages occur in *Peter Wilkins*:

Peter Wilkins

*The Ancient Mariner*⁵

... we observed at some distance a	At first it seemed a little speck,
very black cloud, but seemingly of no	And then it seemed a mist;

⁴ *Table Talk*, July 5, 1834 (*Complete Works* [New York, 1884], VI, 521). A. H. Bullen called attention to this passage in the preface to his edition of *Peter Wilkins* (London, 1884), p. xii, but he made no suggestion that Coleridge's poetry shows any indebtedness to Paltock.

⁵ The text is that of *The Complete Poetical Works*, ed. E. H. Coleridge (Oxford, 1912), Vol. I.

extraordinary size or height, moving very fast towards us, and seeming to follow the ship, which then made great way. Every one on deck was very curious in observing its motions; and perceiving it frequently to divide, and presently to close again, and not to continue long in any determined shape, . . . [p. 11].

. . . as there had been a heavy dew or rain in the night, and we had spread out everything we had of linen and woolen to receive it, we were a little refreshed by wringing our cloaths, and sipping what came from them; . . . [p. 52].

Water, as I said before, to moisten our mouths, was now our greatest hardship, for every man had so often drank his own, that we voided scarce any thing but blood, and that but a few drops at a time; our mouths and tongues were quite flead with drought, and our teeth just falling from our jaws; . . . [p. 53].

. . . we thought we spied a sail coming from the north-west, . . . our fear was, that they should not know our distress, for we were not able to make any noise from our throats, that might be heard fifty yards; . . . [pp. 53-54].

It moved and moved, and took at last
A certain shape, I wist.

A speck, a mist, a shape, I wist!
And still it neared and neared:
As if it dodged a water-sprite,
It plunged and tacked and veered
[ll. 149-56].

The silly buckets on the deck,
That had so long remained,
I dreamt that they were filled with
dew;
And when I awoke, it rained.

My lips were wet, my throat was
cold,
My garments all were dank;
Sure I had drunken in my dreams,
And still my body drank [ll. 297-304].

Water, water, every where,
And all the boards did shrink;
Water, water, every where,
Nor any drop to drink [ll. 119-22].

And every tongue, through utter
drought,
Was withered at the root;
We could not speak, no more than if
We had been choked with soot [ll.
135-38].

When looking westward, I beheld
A something in the sky [ll. 147-48].

With throats unslaked, with black
lips baked,
We could nor laugh nor wail;
Through utter drought all dumb we
stood! [ll. 157-59].

. . . . though the sea was now very calm and smooth, the ship seemed to sail at as great a rate as before; which we attributed to the velocity she had acquired by the storm, or to currents that had set that way by the violence of the winds [p. 75].

But still we were exceedingly puzzled at the ship's making such way; though there was no wind stirring [p. 75].

. . . . I had never seen a troubled sea since I came to the island; for, tho' I heard the wind often roaring over my head, yet it coming away from the land-side, it never disturbed the water near the shore [p. 84].

. . . . nor could I conceive less, than that some subtle spirit had done this prank, merely to terrify me [pp. 79-80].

As I lay awake one night, or day, I know not whether, I very plainly heard the sound of several human voices, nor did the voices seem at all to me like such as I had any where heard before, but much softer and more musical [p. 107].

Without a breeze, without a tide,
She steadies with upright keel! [ll. 169-70].

"But why drives on that ship so fast,
Without or wave or wind?" [ll. 422-23].

The helmsman steered, the ship
moved on;
Yet never a breeze up-blew;
[ll. 335-36].

Till noon we quietly sailed on,
Yet never a breeze did breathe:
Slowly and smoothly went the ship,
Moved onward from beneath [ll. 373-76].

The loud wind never reached the ship,
Yet now the ship moved on! [ll. 327-28].

And some in dreams assuréd were
Of the Spirit that plagued us so:
. . . . [ll. 131-32].

How long in that same fit I lay,
I have not to declare;
But ere my living life returned,
I heard and in my soul discerned
Two voices in the air [ll. 393-97].

The other was a softer voice,
As soft as honey-dew: [ll. 406-07].

In a more detailed comparison of the two narratives than space permits here, it is curious to see how some of the features of Paltock's story are not to Coleridge's purpose at all. The poet makes no use of

some physical horrors, such as the eating of human flesh and the stench of the corpses lying in the boat. On the other hand, things which Paltock passes over lightly or explains in a mechanical fashion, such as the strange creatures of the water, the movement of the ship from beneath, and the voices conversing in the air, become in Coleridge among the most characteristic features of the story.

Apart from all consideration of verbal parallels as such, there are in Paltock's romance ideas, concrete details, and situations which show striking similarities to others in *The Rime of the Ancient Mariner*. Some of these are, no doubt, the common property of the literature of voyages. But I am acquainted with no other narrative which offers in combination all (or anything like all) the features which are characteristic of both *Peter Wilkins* and *The Rime of the Ancient Mariner*, such as the strange old man with "an extravagant beard" who tells the story;⁶ the thirst of the sailors, which is so acute that they cannot cry aloud for help;⁷ the storm which drives the ship far to the south and leaves it becalmed in an unexplored sea;⁸ the ship which moves on without wave or wind;⁹ the realm of icebergs high as ships, a region where no living creature is to be seen;¹⁰ the great musical concert of the flying people;¹¹ the hero who envies the dead man at his side, wishing vainly for his own death;¹² and the suggested moral of the hero's repentance of crime through affliction.¹³

JOHN ROBERT MOORE

INDIANA UNIVERSITY

⁶ *Peter Wilkins*, p. 12.

⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 75.

¹³ *Ibid.*, pp. 76-77.

⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 53-54.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 83.

¹² *Ibid.*, pp. 77, 79.

⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 74.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, p. 228.

BOOK REVIEWS

La Vita Nuova di Dante Alighieri: Edizione critica. Per MICHELE BARBI. ("Società Dantesca Italiana: Edizione nazionale delle opere di Dante," Vol. I.) Firenze: Bemporad, 1932. Pp. cccix+179; 7 pls.

This magnificent initial quarto volume gives a satisfying foretaste of what the long-awaited national edition of Dante's works will be in its entirety. Not greatly dissimilar in general appearance to the 1907 edition, it yet forms a volume nearly 25 per cent thicker, owing mainly to the greatly expanded critical and explanatory footnotes. A dozen of the additional pages are accounted for by the inclusion of two valuable indexes: "Indice di cose notevoli nell'Introduzione" and "Indice delle osservazioni linguistiche contenute nelle note alla *Vita Nuova*."

The changes made in the introduction, as against the 1907 edition, have not been extensive, for the reason, as Professor Barbi explains in his preface, that the basic materials which he has had for his critical study have remained nearly the same, and his painstaking and detailed re-examination of these has convinced him of the correctness of his first findings. In his reconstruction of the text itself but few modifications seemed advisable; and, naturally, still fewer as over his text in the 1921 anniversary edition of *Le opere di Dante: Testo critico della Società Dantesca Italiana*. The reviewer has noted, for example, *pottero* in XXIII, 13, as in the 1921 edition, instead of the *potero* of the first edition; while in XL, 10, *restaste* and *uscireste* have been restored as in the 1907 edition in place of *restate* and *uscirete* in the 1921 *Testo critico*. A fair number of improvements—or, at least, changes—in the punctuation have also been made.

Though the greatly expanded footnotes are rather largely taken up with answers to criticisms contained in reviews of his first edition and in some other published articles—with confutations of E. Sicardi's objections and suggestions occupying perhaps a rather disproportionate amount of space—the present reviewer has found their chief interest to lie in the explanations which they give of changes from the 1907 edition introduced in the (noteless) *Testo critico* of 1921. Among these, he was particularly interested, perhaps, in *beatrice* (XL, 10) as a common noun (with minuscule initial) meaning—in this context—'her who beatifies'; and he would like to suggest, *con deferenza parlando*, that perhaps the minuscule would be acceptable also in those two sole cases (XXII, 3, and XXIV, 5), where *questa....Beatrice* or *quella....Beatrice*, as Professor Barbi notes (p. 87), has no intercalated "epiteto esornativo, o affettivo, come *nobilissima, gloriosa, benedetta, nostra ecc.*" It would make very good

sense in both instances: in the first as a contrast,¹ and in the second as a justification for identifying her with Love.²

Among the many changes, suppressions, additions, and amplifications of the footnotes, the reviewer naturally centered his attention on a few cases dealing with specific points of interpretation in which he has been interested. One of the most interesting of these has to do with the famous clause of II, 1, *li quali non sapeano che si chiamare*—which he had practically decided, a few years ago, was to be satisfactorily explained only on the basis of understanding the clause as if it had read: *li quali non sapeano che si chiamarla*, 'could not call her other than so.'³ But Professor Barbi is more than ever convinced of the correctness of his original interpretation; so that among the several minor modifications in his long note we find a change to "*sensu sodisfacente*" where before he had said: "*....la lezione dei Mss. dà un senso ragionevole.*"⁴

But to return to Professor Barbi's edition as a whole: No brief review—even by a reviewer who felt himself competent for the task—could begin to do justice to this splendid work. Even typographical errors are hard to find; and the general bookwork, from the merely mechanical side, comes near to being worthy of its high mission. It is unlikely that another new edition will be

¹ ".....Molte donne s'adunaro colà dove questa beatrice piangea pietosamente."

² "E chi volesse sottilmente considerare, quella beatrice chiamerebbe Amore per molta simiglianza che ha meco."

In this connection, the reviewer would like to mention *Par.*, X, 37 f.: "E Beatrice quella che al scorge/di bene in meglio al subitamente, che l'atto suo per tempo non si sporge"—where the awkwardness of the construction disappears if we take "Beatrice" to be, not subject, but predicate nominative: 'she who thus conducts from good to better . . . is "She-Who-Makes-Blessed."' Justification for this may perchance be found in *Sap.*, VIII, 4, in which "Sapientia"—with whom Beatrice may fittingly be paralleled—is called "Doctrix....disciplinae Dei, et electrix operum illius," in a sequence of verses to which Dante makes many references in his works (for the ten verses of which this is the last, Moore [*Studies in Dante*, I, 326] gives six parallels, of which one is of A grade); and, among these, VII, 29: "Est enim haec speciosior sole,....luci comparata invenitur prior," is especially striking when compared with the immediately following *terzina*: "Quant'esser convenia da sè lucente/quel ch'era dentro al sol dov'io entra'mi,/non per color, ma per lume parvente!" with its pendent verses—especially vs. 48: "chè sopra 'l sol non fu occhio ch'andasse."

³ The omission of unstressed personal pronoun objects, which was practically standard in classical Latin—e.g., the well-known *ubi solitudinem faciunt, pacem appellant*—pervades not only the neo-Latin languages but Indo-European languages in general to an extent which the reviewer believes calls for thorough investigation. Direct objects of the third person, including reflexives, seem especially to need study in this regard.

E. Sicardi, in his (posthumous) work, *La lingua italiana in Dante* (Roma: "Optima," 1928), pp. 57 ff., seems to have been the first to explain *chiamare* of *VN*, II, 1, as equivalent to *chiamarla*; but the basic thesis of his whole book—he allowed "costrutti sintattici, specie elliptici" (p. 14) almost ad lib.—was of so sweeping and unscientific a nature that more harm than good was done to any individual case that he cited (see a severe review in *Studi danteschi*, XIII, 95 ff.). He gives, however, *inter al.*, a number of examples of omitted object pronouns (especially on pp. 46-67) which would be useful to a further study of this subject.

⁴ It is interesting to note, in connection with the new interpretation suggested above, that Professor Barbi now adduces proofs that this use of *non....che* in the sense of 'only,' 'not other than,' is not exclusively modern—as Zingarelli had objected (*Giornale storico*, LII, 208).

forthcoming, or will be asked for, within the lifetime of this generation. And, meantime, the volume becomes an immediate necessity to every Dantist, and to every self-respecting academic library the world around.

UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA

H. D. AUSTIN

Lope de Vega's "El desdén vengado." Edited with introduction and notes by MABEL MARGARET HARLAN. New York: Instituto de las Españas, 1930. Pp. xlix+196.

As an excellent doctoral thesis (Indiana University), Miss Harlan has carefully edited the autograph manuscript of a *comedia* signed by Lope in Madrid on August 4, 1617, and now preserved in the Osuna collection of the Biblioteca Nacional. A comprehensive introduction and seventy pages of thorough annotation, frequently a genuine contribution to the slow process of charting the media of seventeenth-century Spanish drama, amply justify reprinting, in convenient format, a text already available in Volume XV of the Academia edition, but with a "few" (sixty) erroneous readings, and with no preliminary observations by Menéndez y Pelayo. Miss Harlan, who has already examined the theme of disdain in this and other plays (*Relation of Moreto's "El desdén con el desdén" to Suggested Sources*, "Indiana University Studies" [1924]), again proves herself a Hispanist of sound scholarship, extensive field knowledge, and fine editorial conscientiousness.

Brief but adequate comment on Lope's handling of his unquestioned source, Novella XVII of Bandello's Parte III, leads to a discussion of an exciting autobiographical element. Here Miss Harlan very properly, and indeed rather conservatively, senses the possibility of "in general" identifying Celia with Lucía de Salcedo, Lisena with Doña Marta de Nevares Santoyo, and El Conde Lucindo with Lope himself. A minute comparison of the autograph manuscript with the first printed text of the play, falsely attributed to Francisco de Rojas Zorilla, in *Escogidas* XVI (apparently made up of *sueltas*) shows that as regards versification, scenes (content and sequence), and individual lines, the two plays become less identical as they proceed, that though the general plot and its working-out are the same in both, "in no sense can they be considered one and the same play." Miss Harlan convincingly concludes that the printed text is not so much a *refundición* by Rojas as a composition from notes taken at the time of hearing the play, or from memory—a process of the sort in which *Gran Memoria* and *Memorilla* achieved such amazing virtuosity.

The succinct metrical analysis requires correction on three minor points: (1) The heptasyllabic lines 2466, 2468, and 2474 make it advisable to classify 2447-2506 as a species of *silva*. (2) The frequent occurrence of *pareados acon-*

sonantados in both 1805-66 and 2447-2506 makes it impossible to consider either of these passages as made up entirely of *sueños*. (3) Verses 1931-32 and their burlesque variation 1953-54 really constitute an *estribillo*, of which the first verse is heptasyllabic (not, as read in their respective notes, *a/vn*, *Abre/Ynés*) and the second, as noted, hendecasyllabic. In both instances, this *estribillo* caps a perfectly quaternary *romance* speech with two lines of more unusual length, in both of which it observes the *romance* assonance, so that twice this occurs three times in succession, an unlikely phenomenon if 1931 and 1953 were octosyllabic. Like the ends of Acts I and II, the rest of this passage (1955-94) is not (as stated on p. xxvii) strictly quaternary. On Lope's use of the *estribillo* in *romance* passages, see Montesinos, *Teatro ant. esp.*, VII, 215. Miss Harlan notes the use of *redondillas* as opening form for each act and of the *romance* for passages not *relaciones* or ends of acts. It might also be observed that both passages of *décimas* are *quejas*, as recommended in Lope's *Arte nuevo de hacer comedias*; that of the five *octava* (*real*) passages, four are soliloquies of almost the same short length (of 3, 4, 3, 3, strophes), and one (1453-84) a scene whose comparative *gravedad*, like that of *terza rima* 2625-91, seems determined largely by the mere fact that one of the characters is a *viejo*; that of the *romance* passages tabulated as quaternary or non-quaternary, the former in general consist of, or begin with, longer, fewer, more sententious, more formal, more rhetorical, and more declamatory speeches than do the latter—are, in short, less natural dialogue. Even in Miss Harlan's "non-quaternary" passages, some of the longer speeches (1319-34, 1363 ff., 2547-86) show a regularly recurring marked pause at the end of every fourth verse. Note 32, page xxvii, might also cite S. G. Morley, "The Missing Lines of *La estrella de Sevilla*," *Romanic Review*, XIV (1923), 233-39.

A full description of the manuscript (introduction and footnotes) reveals characteristics that in general correspond closely to those of Lope's other *autógrafos*, and affords, thanks to Miss Harlan's patience in deciphering *tachaduras*, considerable evidence of Lope's painstaking manner of composition. Two items are of unusual interest: the invocation at the top of (apparently) each page, which, varying in legibility, does not seem to be quite "J. M. J." (Jesús, María, José); and at the beginning of each act, a small sketch of two angels kneeling on either side of a chalice from which rises the Host. The latter is the subject of a suggestive note on Lope's skill and interest in drawing, to which may be added the fact that this same sketch also appears, in a corresponding position but in Act I only, on the autograph manuscripts of *El bastardo Mudarra* (1612) and *Quien más no puede* (1616); that Lope refers to himself (Belardo) as a painter in *La prueba de los amigos* of 1604 (*Acad. Nueva ed.*, XI, 113b). Cf. also Icaza, *Lope de Vega: Sus amores y sus odios*, page 73.

Miss Harlan has very generously—and properly—undertaken the arduous task of so annotating this interesting play as to make it really available to

students still unfamiliar with the *siglo de oro*. In grateful appreciation, and with a deep sense of the unusual importance of so authentic a text, the reviewer respectfully contributes the following observations:

23-27. *tanto valor* (cf. also 59, 63) alludes to the King. If *la misma ley* refers to any particular lines, it is to 19-20 ('the fault lies in yourself, not in your master'; cf. 36-38) rather than to the ironical 12-14. Both Conde and Tomin are complaining. The well-explained sense of 25-27 would be clearer, and the awkward parenthesis obviated, with a colon after 24 and a comma after 26.

123. *gentil*: Not 'elegant,' but 'pagan' (*cultilatino, latinizante*). Cf. the frequent *hablar cristiano* (Lope, *Acad. Nueva ed.*, XI, 485a, etc.). To the bibliography on Lope's rôle in maintaining the *viejo estilo* may now be added M. Romera-Navarro's "Lope y su defensa de la pureza de la lengua y estilo poético," *Revue hispanique*, LXXVII, 287-381. Romera-Navarro quotes 2076-80 of *El desdén* as "En el teatro de Lope, la más antigua alusión satírica a los culteranos, de fecha cierta." His other quotations attest the *culto* usage of almost all of the words ridiculed by Lope throughout our play. Cf. also Herrera-García, *Estimaciones literarias del siglo XVII* (Madrid, 1930), pp. 251 ff.; Miguel Artigas, *Don Luis de Góngora* (Madrid, 1925), *passim*.

125-28. The moon and stars of night are the *candor errante* from (a) which day steals, and indeed perpetuates (*vincular* is figurative) its splendor. For the much-abused *emular* = 'display,' cf. Tirso, *La celosa de sí misma*, BAE, V, 130a. The Latinistic *horror* refers to the spreading (bristling) rays of the sun and is modified by *brillante*, the interposed *que afecta* being a parody of the broken word-order affected by *cultistas*. The value of *afecta* is that registered by Covarrubias as "apetecer y procurar alguna cosa con ansia y ahinco." Note the confusing absence of articles, also *a lo latino*.

172. The omission of stage direction for exit, not always very obvious, occurs also at 292, 748, 888, 1764, 1866, 2506, 2624, 2679, 3017. Cf. the entrance at 1473.

185-88. *administra* (not 'supplies') is imperative, and the passage an apostrophe to the birds, bidding them wake the beloved, and others—a stock invocation.

190. Understanding of the otherwise well-explained figure is lessened by the assumption that the third party in the game is Leonardo rather than one of Conde's rivals (Roberto or Feniso). Cf. *Bizarrias de Belisa* (Lope, *Acad. Nueva ed.*, XI, 449a).

304. *la misma causa*: Not Lisena's *aborrecimiento* of Rey, but the fact that Conde's failure to appreciate her is due to his unworthiness, as explained in 305-6.

754-56. The postponed position of *favor* enables it to serve, effectively, in the double capacity of indirect object after *da* and of dative of reference or interest with *hallarla*. The sense of the *a* in *al* is simply 'for' or 'as regards.' The singular *-la* is noteworthy: *ley, doctrina, luz* really constitute a single idea, of which the last two members may be regarded as in apposition with the first.

892. *terrero* probably also involves wordplay on its more literal sense of "El sitio o parage desde donde cortejaban en palacio a las damas" (*Dicc. aut.*).

989. *entra*: cf. 2517. Verbs of stage directions are elsewhere in the subjunctive. The verb of entrance, frequently understood, is *salir* only at 1866, for at 1202 El Rey is already virtually on stage. The reflexive *entrarse* is twice (2402, 2414) used as 'exit.'

1018. *gatesco* involves wordplay on the fundamental *gato* both in its sense of 'money bag [made of cat skin]' and of 'crafty petty little thief' (Connelly and Higgins). Cf. *galazo*, quotation n. 1012, and Lope, *Acad. Nueva ed.*, XI, 134b.

1019. *Más que*: 'I'll bet.' See articles cited by Miss Horlan in note 1308-9.

1041. Conde has already reverted to the *tú* forms (of his first *secne* with Celia, 194, etc.) in 1029, 1032.

1308. [*muerto*] *en tu gracia*: not 'may you not wish it [me dead] in reality,' but merely 'provided I'm not in disfavor.' Cf. [*muerto*] *en tu gusto*, 'without your love' (1245).

1399. The unclear point of comparison seems to lie between the (deadly) extemporaneousness of many contemporary poetasters and the unexpectedness of death. Lope elsewhere criticizes verses that are not *pensados*. The expression *echar coplas de repente* takes a figurative meaning: 'to speak nonsense and without reflection,' 'to talk idly' (Connelly and Higgins).

1452. Note that *Váyase* applies not only to El Rey but to Tomín. Stage directions with a singular verb for two characters, of whom the second is the servant or subject of the first, are not rare. Cf. *Salga el Conde, y* [accompanied by] *Tomín*, 1866, unnecessarily altered to *Salgan* in A and C.

1701. Celia first assumed formal discourse in 1693-98, a solemn proposal.

1793-94. The general sense is satisfactorily explained; but a *mi pena* depends, I think, not on *perder* (as per trans.), but on *miedo*: "My fear of paining myself still more by complicating my grief for the Count."

1805-66, 2447-2506. The rhymed *pareados* do not here, as is sometimes the case, determine or warrant rhythmic divisions, as is suggested by indentation after each instance (except, inconsistently, at 1865, 2476, 2493). Note, for example, the awkward break thus occasioned between 1835-36, 1836-37, 1837-38, 1861-62, 2465-66.

1909. *alma*/*Eurídice* would be preferable to *que/ha*.

2076. *en prosa y en verso*: in verse that is *prosa* in the sense of "conversación o plática impertinente y pesada de alguno, gastando mucha abundancia de palabras y ponderaciones, para expresar alguna cosa de poco momento" (*Dicc. aut.*). Cf. the well-translated *prosa vana* of 1475, and in *Las Bizarrias de Belisa* (Lope, *Acad. Nueva ed.*, XI, 457b), Tello's reference not to prose, but to a sonnet: "con el verso y con la prosa que le enviaste, está loco."

2142. *responde* = *corresponde*.

2206. 'I myself being as much my own enemy as though I were someone else,' i.e., as opposed to the internal enemy, some enemy outside (*estraño*). Understand *yo* as subject to *solicite* (2205), as well as of *siendo*.

2315, 2684. Lope is not in this play guilty of "long" verses: *hauía* and *confío* may be read with syneresis as two syllables. Cf. Morley, *Ortología*, p. 533, sec. 4; and Benot, *Prosodia cast.* (*ilícita contracción*), II, 91, 92, 128, 283.

2469. The subject of *asegure* (subjunctive of emotional oath) is not *él* but *yo*, as is shown by 2470.

2637. The preferable hiatus would be *su/habla*.

2951. Read, as in 2947, *Quién*: "To think that I heard him say . . . !" Another instance of this exclamatory *¡Quién vió ... !*, with first person value and referring to present circumstances as unbelievably different from what once they

were, may be found in *Acad. Nueva ed.*, II, 178a (erroneously punctuated as interrogation).

2969. *se cierra* also involves wordplay suggested by *Echó la tranca*.

2972. Not *qué*, but *que*, pleonastic as in 2761. The suspension points are unnecessary, for the sense of *hauía de haber* ('there would be something happening') is quite complete.

Several unexplained items may perplex the unsophisticated: 857, *cas* = *casa*; 880, 2765, 3010, *aquí*, *desde aquí*, 'hereby'; 894, *lo cierto*, 'the best thing'; 2516, *que* = *sino que*; 2552, *sin* = *sin contar*; 2815, *porque* = *para que*, but with something of *por lo que*; 3015, *acaso*, 'by any chance.'

As regards punctuation, I should prefer to read: 176 as interrogative; comma after 190; period rather than semicolon, 995; *Tú* and semicolon, not period, 996; 997, *dame*; 1448, comma after the second *que*, which might even be accented; ¡*Pues qué!*, 1463; no comma after *canoro*, 2345; 2973-75 as interrogative.

Typographical slips have been reduced to an admirable minimum. I notice only *Noy* for *No* (1633); "1682" (nn. 495 and 1583); "2282" (n. 2196); erroneous indentation (2437).

C. E. ANIBAL

OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY

Oliver's Secretary: John Milton in an Era of Revolt. By DORA NEILL

RAYMOND. New York: Minton, Balch & Co., 1932. Pp. xiv + 341.

This book, which, according to the preface and the introduction, is the result of years of research, in part made possible through a fellowship granted by the American Association of University Women, undertakes to present Milton as "a man of affairs." It is the author's hope that her extended study will have resulted in a mature conception of the part Milton "played in the political development of his time, and of the effect on his life of those political events in which he was concerned." Students of Milton should, I think, welcome a sound study of this theme, but they will be disappointed in Mrs. Raymond's work. It has, indeed, certain virtues. The manner is sprightly—perhaps unduly so. By means of vivid detail and vigorous narrative the reader's interest is fairly sustained. There are not many dull pages. Some of the chapters—for example, xii and xvii—are enriched by pertinent illustrations from rare pamphlets. But there are serious faults. Mrs. Raymond fails to analyze systematically Milton's political opinions and the political issues of his time; she offers little new material; she ignores much of the best recent investigation; and, abounding in mistakes, she perpetuates many old misconceptions and errors. Apparently having in part adopted the Stracheyan attitude, she dwells at times upon the amorous and the unheroic in Milton and the age: for

example, Milton "had known the flesh of little Mary Powell" and felt a "natural revulsion" (p. 75); the Pamela prayer in *Eikon Basilike* "called forth more vituperation than any of the late King's breaches of the constitution" (p. 127); Cromwell is compared to Beelzebub (p. 258). At other times she gives free rein to her imagination: Milton constantly attended the London theaters (p. 12); he was a devotee of Shakespeare (p. 16); the Italian sonnets were addressed to Leonora Baroni (p. 35); Milton closely supervised the advertisements in *Mercurius politicus* and sometimes wrote for it himself (p. 154), etc.

There are three main divisions: Part I, "Training"; Part II, "Combat"; Part III, "Victory." In the first part Mrs. Raymond picturesquely sketches Milton's life to the end of the Italian journey. The account of the life at Cambridge and Milton's academic exercises is greatly inferior to Tillyard's in *Milton: Private Correspondence and Academic Exercises* ([Cambridge, 1932], pp. xvi-xxxix). In chapter iv Leonora Baroni occupies entirely too much space. All the first part, in which politics and religion are only casually treated, might better have been devoted to a careful survey of political and religious conditions and a careful study of Milton's interests therein. As it is, in the second part there is no adequate analysis of the political situation.

Part II, which makes use of rare pamphlets, newspapers, and books, is rather more satisfactory; but here also Mrs. Raymond is far from being a trustworthy guide. For example, in dealing with *Of Reformation*, she says that Milton proposed "the election of priests by parliament and magistrates" (p. 53). But Milton says that ministers should be consecrated by the "full and free election" of the people (*The Student's Milton*, p. 463). The Long Parliament, she says, met in October (p. 51); the month was November. The author has an unfortunate habit of contradicting herself: on page 67 we learn that at Edgehill Rupert defeated Essex's army; on page 69 we are told that at Edgehill the King's army was routed. Actually, it was a drawn battle (G. M. Trevelyan, *England under the Stuarts*, p. 237). On page 71 we learn that Milton's marriage with Mary Powell was not consummated; on page 75 the direct contrary is asserted. This marriage is said to have taken place in 1643; but Mr. B. A. Wright has proved that the date must have been 1642 ("Milton's First Marriage," *Modern Language Review*, XXVI [1931], 383-400; XXVII [1932], 6-23). A serious fault is that the chapter on *Eikonoklastes* ignores W. H. Lowenhaupt's important article, "The Writing of Milton's *Eikonoklastes*" (*Studies in Philology*, XX [1923], 29-51), which provides the setting for Milton's pamphlet. There is also here, and elsewhere, a marked bias against the Commonwealth and plentiful carping at Cromwell. This antipathy is concentrated in a paragraph which, summing up Cromwell's accomplishments, emphasizes all his mistakes but denies all his virtues (p. 194). Mrs. Raymond might with profit have considered Trevelyan's history of this period and his tribute to Cromwell, who "saved the British Empire from partition, the civil

liberties of England from Royalist reconquest, the Free Churches and free-thinkers from destruction by those of the narrow way" (p. 327). By reason of her lack of sympathy, the author does rather less than justice to Milton's defense of the Commonwealth, as in her account of the *Defense of the English People* (pp. 141-46), with its implied doubt of the validity of Milton's premises. Most astonishing is the fact that in the scattered discussion of Milton's sonnets no use is made of J. S. Smart's indispensable edition. Especially does the author's discussion of the massacre of the Vaudois (pp. 185-86) suffer from her not being acquainted with Smart's valuable notes. This is also true of her account of Milton's second wife (p. 191). Again, Milton's first sonnet on his blindness (1652) is quoted (p. 188) with this remark: "This sonnet is the sepulcher of the Milton who could rage for personal reasons against a rival scholar. What perished needs no lamenting." Yet, according to her own account, the *Second Defense*, with its scourging of his opponents, was written from "December 1, 1653, to June, 1654" (p. 175). Space permits the mention of only two more errors in Part II. The public burning of Milton's books is dated August 29 (p. 226); the correct date is August 27. Again, Mrs. Raymond gives a confused account of Milton's arrest, omitting the resolution of Parliament, June 16, calling for his arrest and instructing the attorney-general to prosecute him and Goodwin (pp. 228-29). Masson's story is much clearer and more definite (*The Life of John Milton*, VI, 190 ff.).

Part III, devoted to an account of Milton's last years and some discussion of his great poems, also has its share of errors. For example, in her sketch of the trial of Lambert and Vane, Mrs. Raymond writes, "By the King's favor, Lambert was reprieved" (p. 236). She fails to say that the King had previously pledged himself not to take their lives and that in allowing Vane's execution he broke his promise (Masson, VI, 230-31). The story of Milton's cruelty to his daughters is retold, and nothing is said in extenuation. Helen Darbishire's introduction to *The Early Lives of Milton* (London, 1932), pages xlix-lili, should be consulted for a juster account. We are told by Mrs. Raymond that John Phillips did not visit his uncle (p. 237). Miss Darbishire has proved that John kept in touch with his uncle, of whom he probably wrote the excellent earliest life (*ibid.*, pp. xvi-xxvii). Milton is said to have arranged for the publication of *Paradise Lost* and then to have consulted the licenser (pp. 242-43). The correct order is just the reverse. It is said that Tomkyns, the licenser who passed on *Paradise Lost*, "had officiated at the marriage of Milton to Elizabeth Minshull" (p. 243). The marriage was performed by Dr. Robert Gell, Tomkyns' predecessor at St. Mary Aldermary (Masson, VI, 506). In the discussion of the astronomy of *Paradise Lost*, one reads that "by extension of poetic license, Milton ignored scientific truth" (p. 249). Mrs. Raymond should read *Paradise Lost*, Book VIII, and A. H. Gilbert, "Milton and Galileo," *Studies in Philology*, XIX (1922), 152-75. The theme of the epic is said to be "Lucifer's great fall" (p. 265)—not the fall of man. It is said that "in 1668,

Simmons decided on a new edition" of *Paradise Lost* (p. 266; cf. p. 245). But this was only a new binding of the first edition (cf. G. C. Williamson, *The Portraits, Prints and Writings of John Milton* [Cambridge, 1908], p. 98). It is also said that the *History of Britain* does not include the Norman Conquest (pp. 269-70).

The list of errors might easily be extended: Milton's lines to Shakespeare are called a sonnet (pp. 26, 127); the Countess Dowager of Derby becomes a Duchess (p. 24); the nightingale sonnet is assigned to the Horton period (p. 23); poetry is misquoted ("hath" for "has" and "sphearing" for "Spheary," p. 25, and many others, *passim*); Milton's sight is said to have failed first in the right eye (it was the left; cf. *Milton: Private Correspondence and Academic Exercises*, p. 31); it is implied that Salmasius died in 1653 (p. 174); the name of Milton's assistant in the secretaryship is given as Philip Meadows (pp. 174, 184); Milton's licensing of *Mercurius politicus* is said to have begun with the thirty-fifth issue, February 6, 1651 (p. 154); the notes do not always support the text (p. 93, n. 5; p. 134, n. 1, etc.); the account of Milton's amanuenses is hopelessly confused (pp. 232, 236-38). But there is no need to give more examples. More than enough have been produced to prove that the promise of the preface has not been fulfilled. Although the final impression of the charitable reader, who takes into account the graphic style, the brisk survey of movements, the sprightly discussions of Milton's rather bulky pamphlets, the fairly adequate appreciation of Milton, may not be one of absolute dissatisfaction, it is nevertheless true that in a work with pretensions to scholarship such faults as have been pointed out cannot be condoned. Years of research should have borne better fruit.

GEORGE W. WHITING

THE RICE INSTITUTE

The Life of Robert Burns. By FRANKLYN BLISS SNYDER. New York: Macmillan Co., 1932. Pp. xiv+524.

Much as has been written on its perennially popular subject, this is an important book, admirably fulfilling its aim as succinctly expressed at the beginning of the preface—"To tell the story of Burns's life as truthfully as possible, discriminating between verifiable fact and unsubstantiated anecdote." Many "unsubstantiated anecdotes" of Burns are interesting—even fascinating; many may have had basis in fact and many are such as one would like to believe; but, on the other hand, many are demonstrably false and have contributed to false or exaggerated impressions. And not a few of these persist in the other most recent life of Burns,¹ which in its mixture of fact and fiction and its almost total lack of documentation is little more worthy of acceptance as authority than *Ariel*.

¹ That by Mrs. Catherine Carswell (London, 1930).

It is hard to understand why so many authors—some of them perhaps over-persuaded by publishers who fear a supposed popular prejudice against “foot-notes”—should neglect to indicate authority for assertions of which critical readers are certain to seek the evidence. And therefore it is a particular pleasure to record that Professor Snyder most punctiliously indicates his sources of information by means of a series of numbered notes at the end of each chapter; so that both the reader who wishes a continued story uninterrupted by footnotes and the student who may need or wish to refer to the evidence may be satisfied.

An important feature of Professor Snyder's book is his attention to background—both historical and geographic. “Burns's Ayrshire” is the title of the first chapter; and as Burns moved from place to place, this biographer provides illuminating but not overelaborate descriptions of Mauchline, of Edinburgh (with a beautiful reproduction of an old “plan” of 1787), of Dumfries, and the other homes of the poet; with pleasant impressions here and there from the author's own recent visits to the historic spots. Environment explains much that is not otherwise easily understandable about Burns. It is also important to know about the men and women with whom he had closest relations, and these, too, are well characterized; the relations well explained.

Of course no one writes about Burns without entering speedily into controversial ground; but—granted the difficulties and inevitable disagreements—Professor Snyder's method in such matters seems irreproachable. Take, for instance, the “Highland Mary” story. Mr. Snyder first recites external evidences, “before the mythmakers had begun their work with Burns,” of the identity of the Mary Campbell who was buried at Greenock with the “Highland Mary” of Burns's lyrics, and the connection of this girl and Burns with the famous Bible in the Ayr monument. Then he presents the essential facts about “nine documents,” in Burns's own work, “which may reasonably be interpreted as referring to the Highland Mary episode” (p. 133). This positive evidence, however, does not account for the popular tradition that Mary Campbell was a sort of Beatrice to Burns, and the difficulties in the path of the “Mariolaters” are next recited. Finally comes a cautiously phrased statement of the way in which the difficulties disappear if the child whose coffin was discovered in 1920 at the foot of Mary Campbell's grave was her child by Burns. Unfortunately—or perhaps fortunately for the “Mariolaters”—recent communications to the *Times Literary Supplement* assert that, in the case of a mother's dying in childbirth and the child's dying with her, the Scottish custom has long been to bury both in the same coffin.² But whatever the effect of this on the case, how different is Mr. Snyder's procedure from Mrs. Carswell's assumption, without evidence, that Mary Campbell certainly had a child by Burns!

Similar cautious methods are followed on other controversial points. If the

² *TLS*, August 11 and October 10, 1932, pp. 569, 761.

author can be charged with having any thesis, it is that the years at Dumfries were not a period of deterioration and that Burns did not "drink himself to death." Various short articles published by Professor Snyder while he was working up the material for this biography have demonstrated his views on the subject, and it must be admitted that he makes a strong case without noticeably suppressing such evidence as there is on the other side. It is really inconceivable that Burns could have got along as well as he did in the excise if the early biographers responsible for the "tradition of alcoholism and debauchery" had been right.

The section of chapter v, "The Kilmarnock Volume," dealing with "Omissions from the Volume" (pp. 157-65), is interesting and valuable even if one questions the somewhat startling conclusion that such omissions would have made a collection "at least as notable as that which John Wilson printed." Marvelous as are *The Jolly Beggars* and *Holy Willie's Prayer*—to mention only the most striking of the omitted pieces—most of the other work then unprinted was, on Mr. Snyder's own showing, either too slight or too personal, and practically none of it except the two pieces just mentioned and the *Address to the Unco Guid* has ever been considered on a par with the best of Burns's work.

Similarly extravagant seems the assertion at the end of chapter ix that "at Ellisland . . . Burns grew to his full stature as a poet," in spite of the fact that the foregoing summary mentions *Tam o' Shanter* and a number of his best songs. So also appears to this reviewer the statement (p. 417) that "the summer of 1793 was . . . a period of astonishing creative activity, comparable, indeed, to the months at Mossgiel when he was piling up the MSS that went into the Kilmarnock volume." Here, perhaps more than elsewhere, appears a regrettable effect of the author's "thesis" mentioned above. One can recognize adequately the undoubted facts that, considering the stress of farm work and excise duties and the physical handicaps due to overstrain during adolescence, the poet in Burns functioned amazingly at both Ellisland and Dumfries, without trying to upset the conviction of an overwhelming majority of readers that, with the exception of *Tam o' Shanter* and a considerable number of his best songs, nearly all of his memorable writing came early in his career.

The "Bibliographical Notes" on pages 477-98 are extremely valuable. One might raise a question whether J. P. Anderson's bibliography in the "Great Writers" *Life of Burns* (London: Scott, 1888) should not be mentioned. As to editions, though the text of Henley and Henderson's "Centenary Burns" is probably the best in wording, it contains such liberties in punctuation as actually to change the construction of sentences, in several instances cited by me in an article on "The Text of Burns."³ I have indicated, also, in a review of Professor Ferguson's *Letters of Burns*,⁴ reasons why the editorial mat-

³ *Mainly Anniversary Studies* (Chicago, 1923), pp. 219-28.

⁴ *Mod. Phil.*, XXX (1932), 118-21.

ter therein does not seem to me as "ample" as Professor Snyder seems to have found it (p. 496).

These are all small matters, however. The essential fact remains that this new biography provides by far the best place in existence in which to learn the truth about Burns.

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

GEORGE L. MARSH

Ballad Books and Ballad Men: Raids and Rescues in Britain, America, and the Scandinavian North since 1800. By SIGURD BERNHARD HUSTVEDT. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1930. Pp. ix+376.

This book, admirable in content and appearance, continues the history of English and Scandinavian ballad studies begun by the same author in his *Ballad Criticism in Scandinavia and Great Britain during the Eighteenth Century* (Cambridge, 1916). It reviews concisely and instructively the rising tide of interest in the ballad on opposite shores of the North Sea. In this later epoch the direct impulse from German scholarship had ceased in large measure. Hence Hustvedt's restriction of his survey to England and Scandinavia justifies itself. The student of the German ballad can only regret that there is no companion volume dealing with his special interests. After the initial impulse given by German Romanticism had been transmitted to the adjoining nations, there seems to have been little new stimulation from Germany and little connection with the later developments there. Ludwig Uhland's *Alle hoch- und niederdeutsche Volkslieder* (Stuttgart, 1844-45), for example, is a compilation parallel to those made in England and Scandinavia, but its influence was negligible outside of Germany.

Hustvedt surveys the interest in ballads as shown by collections and imitations. The account of English ballad studies is admirably complete and the proportions well chosen. Perhaps he hurries too rapidly over the later period, beginning with the activities of the Ballad Society. At any rate, he deprives us of the hope for a third volume which might treat the history of ballad studies since Svend Grundtvig and Francis James Child. Their monumental collections would have formed an appropriate climax for this volume, and such a disposition of the material would have left the hope for a continuation. So far as I can see, the review of English ballad collections is admirable.¹ The parallel review of Danish collections brings an excellent account of the "Bat-

¹ It is a small matter, indeed, to suggest that if J. O. Halliwell's interest in nursery rhymes and W. W. Newell's *Games and Songs of American Children* are mentioned, then Joseph Ritson's *Gammer Gurton's Garland* should certainly have had a line. But all such works are beside Hustvedt's purpose and no fault can be found in the omission.

tle of the Ballads" which preceded the publication of the first volume of *Danmarks gamle Folkeviser*. Nothing so clear and concise has been available in English. The review of the imitations of ballads in English poetry has no parallel in Hustvedt's survey of Scandinavian conditions. Here is a task which remains to be done. Perhaps he will yet accomplish it in the same genial manner as the treatment of English art ballads. The review of ballad scholarship after the publication of the two great collections, *Danmarks gamle Folkeviser* and the *English and Scottish Popular Ballads*, is cursory. The full significance of Cecil J. Sharp's studies in popular music is perceived only by the reader who is already somewhat familiar with his work. The efforts of Sofus Larsen and Ernst von der Recke to reconstruct ballads from the traditional variants might have been described more fully, since English readers know little or nothing about such endeavors. In sum, an excellent book.

ARCHER TAYLOR

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

Conrad Ferdinand Meyer: The Style and the Man. By ARTHUR BURKHARD. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1932. Pp. 225.

This study is "the first comprehensive treatment in English of the personality and literary production" of C. F. Meyer. Professor Burkhard begins by setting forth his aim, method, and the manner of presentation of his material. His purpose is that "of interpreting correctly Meyer's personality on the basis of his style." As a description of Professor Burkhard's actual accomplishment this statement does not seem a happy one. What he really does—and does successfully—is to interpret the poet's style on the basis of his personality. He shows in detail how Meyer's character and the principles found in his non-poetic writings shape his style. Thus the personality of the poet, rather than his style, is the point of departure. In this interpretation of Meyer's style lies the chief merit of the book. As to method, Professor Burkhard says that in his analysis of the poet's works he has first tried to strip the sentences of all adornments, asking himself, What did the poet mean by this? and that he has then followed as far as possible the life-history of the thought to the final form of expression, seeking to answer the question, How did the poet come to say it in this particular way? The presentation of the material resulting from this stylistic analysis is excellent. Examples sufficient to illustrate the author's points are incorporated in the text, but the greater part of the statistical material is relegated to the notes. In the second half of the introduction Professor Burkhard reviews facts showing Meyer's great struggle to express himself, his habit of continually correcting, revising, and improving, which gave to his art its dignity, elegance, and monumental grandeur.

The stylistic analysis is given in two chapters. In the first, Professor Burk-

hard cites Meyer's statement to his publisher, Haessel, "Grosser Styl, Grosse Kunst, all mein Denken und Träumen liegt darin." He then treats in detail the nobility of expression characteristic of Meyer and concludes that "in his selecting and simplifying, in the elegance of his diction and the compression of his style, . . . Meyer was primarily interested in attaining the majestic sublimity and monumental grandeur of what he called 'Grosser Styl, Grosse Kunst.'" The second part of the analysis treats the qualities of precision and plasticity in the poet's works and shows that they resulted from the ideal implied in his remark: "Plastisch greifbare Gestalten hervorzuzaubern und sie handelnd auftreten zu lassen, das ist eine Kunst, die nur verschwindend Wenigen gegeben ist." The final chapter of the book is devoted to a general conclusion. This treats first "the principle of polarity" in Meyer's life and works. Professor Burkhard interprets the well-known contrast of characters in the poet's stories and the resulting conflict of motives as originating from a polarity in the poet himself: "In this general polarity between sensual indulgence and austere denial, sensuous aestheticism and moral asceticism, unscrupulous cruelty and inhibitions imposed by conscience, between assertion and resignation, Meyer was portraying his opposite and himself, the conflict in his own breast." A judicious appraisal of Meyer's accomplishment and of his place in German literature concludes the study. Professor Burkhard takes an intermediate position between such violent critics of Meyer as Baumgarten, and those who have been blindly enthusiastic. Regarding the poet's manner, he says that it sometimes becomes mannerism, but that "Meyer produced stories which stand as excellent examples of polished prose . . . and which have remained to serve as models for such distinguished stylists in contemporary German literature as Wilhelm Schäfer, Ricarda Huch, and Thomas Mann. . . . If his poems lack immediacy of emotional appeal, being based on reminiscences rather than on actual sensuous experiences recollected in tranquillity, if many of the verses betray the labor spent on them, they offer as compensation the merits of compact form and powerful concentration of expression." A selected bibliography is included in the volume.

In conclusion we may call attention to some minor points. The following Germanisms occur in the text: *Ludwig Ariost*, page 21; *Cäsar* (Borgia), pages 32 and 51; *Ludwig* (XIV), page 56; *Kanzler*, page 77; *Papst* (Clemens), page 142; and *Gustav Adolf*, page 152. The exclusive use of the English forms, which predominate in the book, would have been better. A few typographical errors occur: *Lastern*, page 47, should be written *Lästern*; *neigt*, page 100, should be written *neigte*; on page 112 *Huguenot* is correct instead of *Hugenot*; on page 120 *in* is correct instead of *im*, and a comma should stand after *bekannte*; and on page 129 the *c* in *shakespeareisere* should be omitted.

R. TRAVIS HARDAWAY

UNIVERSITY OF ROCHESTER

The Mind of Poe and Other Studies. By KILLIS CAMPBELL. Cambridge: Harvard University Press. Pp. 238.

This collection of seven papers includes four which have been published before, either in *PMLA* or in *Studies in Philology*. Of these papers two are corrective of repeated misstatements about Poe: that "he was but little esteemed in his own day," a statement which is modified by the facts assembled in "The Contemporary Opinion of Poe"; and that he revealed "in his writings little or no touch with his times or with the land of his birth," for which there is abundant evidence to the contrary in "The Background of Poe." Two of the reprinted and augmented articles present admirably complete surveys of complicated subjects: "The Poe-Griswold Controversy" and "The Poe Canon." It seems unlikely that there will be more to say on these latter themes until new data are discovered.

Of the remaining trio the number on "Self-Revelation in Poe's Poems and Tales" deals somewhat scantily with the poet's "self-revelation" in the exposition of his ideas (a subject which would include all his work and all its implications), but presents fully and in smallest detail most, if not all, of the passages which are related to his objective experiences. The paper on "The Origins of Poe"—the sources of his material—covers both the general and the particular, and starts with the manifestly sound thesis that "Poe was a product of the Romantic Movement, a scion of the same stock that gave to us Byron and Shelley and Moore and Coleridge." The American's specific indebtedness to this quartet is discussed, though the discussion too soon becomes like Poe's own criticisms in abandoning ideas and concentrating on couplets, lines, phrases, and single epithets. In the section on the origins of Poe's poems *The Raven* naturally comes in for several allusions: to Mrs. Browning's *Lady Geraldine's Courtship* and from that to Dickens' *Barnaby Rudge*. But it is notable in this and other connections that, though some of the connections are quite tenuous, no mention is made of the interrelations between Poe and Chivers. Certainly enough has been said on this problem, and on both sides of it, to justify the reader in expecting some allusion to it, if only for the purpose of explaining why Mr. Campbell regards Chivers as exclusively the debtor, Poe wholly the creditor. The treatment of the tales and their sources is interesting and full, and careful acknowledgment is made of the various researches that are summarized. There will doubtless be further contributions to this subject; witness the question of *The Cask of Amontillado* related "probably" only to Balzac's *La grande Bretèche*, for Mr. Joseph Schick has not yet published his demonstration of a source in Headley's *Sacred Mountains*. For the most part Mr. Campbell's compilation is, with the exception noted, completely up to date, and he, of course, has his reasons for the ostracism of Chivers.

The title essay on "The Mind of Poe" is in some respects the least satisfying of the whole group. This, like the essays on "The Contemporary Opinion"

and "The Background," is written to dispose of a current verdict, quoted from Lanier: "The trouble with Poe was, he did not *know* enough." Mr. Campbell undertakes to present an inventory of Poe's knowledge. He does not make much of a case, and begs the question, in a section on "the fiber of Poe's mind," by asserting "no American author, I think, has exhibited more of clarity in his writing, none more of independence in his thinking, and few, if any, more of originality." These statements, which are unrelated to Poe's knowledge, with which the essay begins and ends, are highly debatable. But Mr. Campbell gives the case away in a series of final concessions: "He was not, of course, a scholar, nor professed to be—nor needed to be. He lacked common sense and practical wisdom. He was frequently inaccurate, and he was seldom thorough. His knowledge of some fields was beyond any question restricted." The outcome of the essay is that Mr. Campbell's essential honesty overcomes his loyalty, conviction conquering sentiment, as it should have done. Fortunately, in the other essays this scholar and critic is not similarly at odds with himself; and in his seven studies he has included a sounder body of fact than I know where to look for in any other single work on Poe.

PERCY H. BOYNTON

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

BRIEFER MENTION

Die Vereinigten Staaten von Amerika, by Friedrich Schoenemann (Stuttgart und Berlin: Deutsche Verlags-Anstalt, 1932; 2 vols.), takes its place in a series which includes comparable studies, thus far, of England, France, Spain, and New Turkey. It is written by a professor of literature, though the approach to the subject is in terms of political, economic, sociological phenomena. Professor Schoenemann's qualifications for the task are not only in his command of the book resources but also in the fruits of his nine-year residence in the United States as a member of the Harvard faculty and of subsequent visits to the country. It is therefore a deliberate piece of work, written in full recognition of the complexity of the subject and of the unanswered questions with which it must end. And it is written not for the American reader, but in the hope of making intelligible to the German student some basic facts and truths about a country of which the intelligent German is, in his opinion, even more uninformed than he was of England in 1914.

A work of this sort written by a scholar of Professor Schoenemann's qualifications, and with his declared purpose, is inevitably interesting to the American who realizes that the viewpoint of the foreign commentator is bound to be interesting as one national culture is brought to bear on another. The book is far too compendious a political and social study for detailed comment in a literary journal. It is perhaps enough to say that it is entitled to a place beside Bryce's equally voluminous study, and the briefer and more recent interpretations of America by André Siegfried and Bernard Fay.—PERCY H. BOYNTON.

In surveying the figure of the nun as described by writers of didactic, historical, romantic, and satiric materials in England from Anglo-Saxon times through the Middle Ages, Sister Mary of the Incarnation Byrne finds a singularly uniform type prevailing in all the different genres (*The Tradition of the Nun in Medieval England*. Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America, 1932; pp. xxxv+235). The romances alone have created, notably in the figure of Guenevere, another character for the nun, and this Sister Mary regards as the model, through the mediation of Malory, for the conception of the nun in later English literature. This dissertation provides us with a comprehensive list of references to nuns and abbesses in older English literature. The writer indexes also the references to the nun in the English books of exempla, whether written in English or in Latin, and thus supplies a brief and useful handlist for this body of literature which exceeds merely national limits.—A. T.

Professor Stanley P. Chase and the members of his Chaucer course in Bowdoin College have published an edition of *The Pearl* (Boston: Bruce Humphries, Inc., 1932). The motive for the edition was the idea that many readers might feel attracted to the poem if "scyrvenish" obsolete letters" and "all those useful but cluttery gadgets of the compositors shop—brackets, italics, asterisks, and daggers," were removed. Hence \mathfrak{z} is replaced by *y*, *gh*, or *s*; *p* by *th*; *u* and *v* are used as in modern printing; and all "gadgets" are omitted. The edition offers no introduction or notes of explanation, but in an appendix gives the textual variants in full, a half-page note on the dialect, and a page and a half of bibliography; it also provides a glossary in which only rare words are given. The plan is carried out with great accuracy. In only one place has a mistake in transliteration been noted: *bogh* should be *bos* (the verb 'behoove' never had a *gh* in it!). In punctuation and in acceptance of emendations when Osgood and Gollancz disagree, the editors have shown good judgment. Not so advisedly they have adopted occasionally suggestions of Professor Emerson which are largely unimportant alterations in spelling based on a theory of meter or on the desire to make rhyme words look alike. The editors have included in the glossary almost all the words which a reader familiar with Chaucer would need. They have omitted a few, however, which are rarer than some that they include; e.g., *boy* (meaning 'rascal'), *mode* (as a term of music), *scale* ('surface'), *sonde* ('sending'). As the edition offers no new interpretations or emendations, it is not an original contribution to our knowledge of the poem. But if substitution of some modern letters for obsolete ones and omission of "gadgets" really will make the poem attractive to people who would not read it otherwise, medievalists will acknowledge a debt to Professor Chase and his associates.

As part of the same activity, no doubt, Professor Chase has produced a translation of the poem (*The Pearl*; New York: Oxford University Press, 1932), in a volume beautifully printed and bound. The book includes an introduction of about fifty pages, a translation in the stanzaic form of the original, and a select bibliography. The introduction, a simple, judicious survey of the views concerning the meaning of the poem, is not sentimental in attitude and is certainly the only really sensible and up-to-date summary for general readers now in print. The translation is clear and reasonably close to the original, but it is compelled often to sacrifice alliteration; in some places (e.g., the first stanza) it does not preserve the constructions and alliteration of the original as well as Miss Weston's does. The bibliography includes most of the recent important writings, but, strangely enough, lists Bateson's edition of *Patience* and Menner's of *Cleanness*, rather than Gollancz's later editions of those poems.—J. R. H.

George G. Fox excerpts Gower's notions on such subjects as nature, fortune, the microcosm and macrocosm, astrology, dreams, alchemy, and

magic in his dissertation, *The Medieval Sciences in the Works of John Gower* ("Princeton Studies in English," No. VI). Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1931; pp. 164). It appears that Gower's knowledge was neither abundant nor exact, and that it did not differ significantly from the conventional store of information possessed by the average intelligent person of his day. Dr. Fox draws some incidental comparative materials from medieval authorities. He makes little use of modern scholarship in the history of science, except as it is available in Thorndike's treatise. Since he concludes, justly enough, that Gower's knowledge of science was neither profound nor vital, he was not tempted to take more than a superficial and passing glance at medieval and modern writers.—A. T.

The Griselda story, so widely known since the Renaissance, offers many problems to the student of literature, and these problems have been the object of much attention. Perhaps more has been written on the Griselda story than on any similar theme. Yet the possibilities are not exhausted. The origins are still a subject of dispute: Wirt Cate ("The Problem of the Origin of the Griselda Story," *Studies in Philology*, XXIX [1932], 389-405) calls in question the theories of Dudley David Griffith. The dissemination of the Griselda story is not entirely clear, although K. Laserstein writes at length on *Der Griseldisstoff in der Weltliteratur* ("Forschungen zur neueren Literaturgeschichte," No. 58 [Weimar, 1926]). And, to go back to the essentials of all problems concerning the Griselda story, Petrarch's text, which is fundamental in its importance, is not yet accessible in a completely satisfactory form. Elie Golenistcheff-Koutouzoff makes a valuable addition to our knowledge in *L'Histoire de Griseldis en France au XIV^e et au XV^e siècle* (Paris: E. Droz, 1933; pp. 291). Although all these French texts are ultimately Petrarchan in origin, it is instructive to have reliable editions of them and to learn their relations. We are grateful also for the reprinting of Petrarch's version from a manuscript with variants of a second manuscript. A similar task remains to be done for the early German versions of the Griselda story, as we see from Stammmler's remarks (*Von der Mystik zum Barock*, "Epochen der deutschen Literatur," II, Part I [Stuttgart, 1927], 28 n., 464-65). See furthermore the recent contributions to the subject: Voullième's edition of the German incunabulum (Potsdam, 1920) and Strauch's edition of *Die Grisardis des Erhart Grosz* ("Altdeutsche Textbibliothek," No. 29 [Halle, 1931]).—A. T.

In *A History of Shakespearian Criticism* (London and New York: Oxford University Press, 1932; 2 vols.) Augustus Ralli has "made a selection from the countless works on the subject," following the "course of aesthetic opinion on Shakespeare from his own time to the end of 1925 in England, France, and Germany." Emphasis is laid on the characteristic ideas of important critics, and, in the comment at the end of sections and chapters, attention is called

to the development of attitudes and schools in the three countries. Hence studies of the life, of sources, and of other historical material are usually disregarded. Sir Sidney Lee's *Life* is included, however, on the ground that he "makes Shakespeare's merit stand out by comparing his treatment of the same themes as earlier or contemporary dramatists have treated, or remarking on the use he makes of his sources" (II, 125). On the other hand, none of the work of Halliwell-Phillips is noticed. The vast body of critical comment that has been appearing in magazines and journals since the eighteenth century is also in the main disregarded, except as it may be represented, for important writers, in volumes of collected works. Critics other than those of Germany and France are grouped as English, probably because in most cases the works surveyed have appeared in English editions. Thus in the English group are included a few modern Continental critics, like Croce and Dyboski, and nearly a score of Americans, from Emerson to the present day. The failure to deal more fully with American criticism and its significance is to my mind a serious defect. Most editors are neglected, even those who, like Misses Porter and Clark, contribute interpretative essays with their texts. In the treatment of Stoll's critical work, there is a full analysis of his *Shakespeare Studies*, but no notice of his most fully developed pieces of criticism, *Hamlet* and *Othello*, which came out as monographs in the publications of the University of Minnesota. The comment on Verplanck as one who "keeps closest to earth" (I, 284) and emphasizes the fact that Shakespeare "learnt his business gradually by following the models of his day" (I, 278) implies the early development in America of a characteristic feature of modern Shakespearean criticism, interpretation through the study of historical backgrounds. In the reaction against the abstract metaphysical speculation of the nineteenth century, American criticism has in my opinion played a leading rôle. In spite of some gaps, however, Ralli's work is very valuable. Almost all the really significant critical literature on Shakespeare is digested here in clear and apparently accurate summaries. The two volumes furnish a good guide for the average student through the mazes of an overwhelming field. Further, the attempt to trace the "course of aesthetic ideas" in Shakespearean criticism is an important contribution to the history of modern thought, though the general relation of criticism to other currents of thought calls for a more thorough study than has yet been given to it.—C. R. B.

Recent publications concerning Balzac include the following titles. Marc Blanchard has published (Paris: Champion, 1931) a major and a minor thesis: *La Campagne et ses habitants dans l'œuvre de Honoré de Balzac* and *Témoignages et jugements sur Balzac*. The former work, which bears as subtitle *Etude des idées de Balzac sur la grande propriété*, is within its range thoroughgoing. Basing his study on the three novels where Balzac really exploits country life, M. Blanchard finds the novelist deficient, first in personal knowledge

of the country, then in practical demonstrations of his abstract views regarding the peasants. It is admitted that Balzac could depict this class in its concrete ways of living, as well as in the play of interests and passions. But it is held that he did not adequately know the interrelations of farm and village life, and that as a political economist he was led astray by certain a priori conceptions of "eminent domain." The dissertation attempts to test the novelist by frequent references to alleged data furnished by the social sciences. The treatment is often too *touffu*, with too many digressions. There is a full index of proper names and a "Bibliographie raisonnée."

M. Blanchard's *thèse complémentaire* is, again, rather a jumble. Its title does not cover such hors d'œuvre as a list of 350 French authors mentioned by Balzac. The author's intention—to illustrate a century of judgments on Balzac's personality and writings—is admirable. But under each caption there is often a lack of sequence, logical or chronological. Surely it were better to distinguish uniformly between what Balzac's contemporaries said about him and what later critics have opined. Among these, the names of certain authorities occur again and again, while other European critics have less than their due place. The organization of the material is in part strongly suggestive of the method followed in Royce's *Indexes to a Balzac Bibliography*. The work is marred by many errata. But it has an undeniable usefulness.

In his principal thesis, M. Blanchard took the view that Balzac's influence in the practical world of affairs was almost nil. That this is an error would appear from René Bouvier's *Balzac, homme d'affaires* (Paris: Champion, 1930). The extent to which the novelist's plans and programs have been realized, e.g., in the development of the region around the Grande Chartreuse, is clearly indicated in the "Avant-propos" to M. Bouvier's monograph. The latter wisely limits his treatment to a few *questions financières industrielles et agricoles*, with which he is personally familiar; he explains the technical processes underlying half-a-dozen salient cases, such as Birotteau's bankruptcy or Mme Graslin's hydraulics. The volume has also a distinctly literary value, because of the way in which business types and their background are set forth. The recent study by Emmanuel Faillettaz (*Balzac et le monde des affaires*; Lausanne and Geneva: Payot, 1932) was designed to be complementary to that of Bouvier. As a matter of fact, the same ground is in part covered again. After an excellent introduction on milieu, M. Faillettaz discusses in three sections Balzac's commercial characters, his (mainly conservative) economic ideas, and his personal ventures into the world of business. While duly noting the small number of industrial leaders and manufacturers in the *Comédie humaine*, the Swiss scholar is led to the doubtful conclusion that Balzac on the whole allows a greater place to business than it occupied in real life. He submits the question whether there is too much pessimism in Balzac's picture of conditions. None of the authors mentioned above has been quite able to surmount the difficulty—which M. Faillettaz frankly acknowledges—of deter-

mining from contemporary documents whether the picture was kept within just proportions.

Studies on the vogue and influence of Balzac in various countries are finally getting under way; the time is ripe, and the necessary bibliographical aids are now available. *Balzac en Angleterre* is being undertaken at the Sorbonne. Material is accumulating toward a *Balzac in Russia*, which would surely demand a polyglot. In his *Balzac aux Etats-Unis* (Paris: Les Presses Modernes, 1931), Mr. Benjamin Griffith has endeavored to establish the high points of Balzac's vogue in America and to indicate, within a restricted field, certain influences emanating from the *Comédie humaine*. Mr. Victor L. Leathers instead of doing a "Balzac in Spain," turns his eyes in the reverse direction. *L'Espagne et les Espagnols dans l'œuvre de Honoré de Balzac* (Paris: Champion, 1931) shows us the novelist *hispanisant*. The subject is rather unrewarding: Balzac was less affected by things Spanish than by things Italian. Mr. Leathers has made the most of his slim material by surrounding it with observations on the general Romantic cult of Spain, the tendencies of certain salons, the interest aroused by the peninsular wars. Balzac shared this military interest and conversed with certain veterans of the Empire. With the aid of his reading, he built up a romanticized conception of the country and of its inhabitants. Yet Spanish personages figure mainly in but a few *nouvelles*, and these, with the exception of *La grande Bretèche*, are not of the first order. Mr. Leathers admits that "l'Espagne pour lui est plutôt un état d'âme qu'un pays géographique." The subject of "Balzac in Spain" should give ampler results than this monograph on Spain as affecting Balzac.—E. P. D.

Il était grand temps que l'on eût une version fidèle, complète et surtout intelligible des *Poésies* de Théophile Gautier. En 1927, M. J. Madeleine donnait une édition critique d'*Emaux et Camées* ("Textes français modernes"), basée sur le texte définitif de 1872. L'intérêt du travail minutieux de M. Madeleine c'est de nous faire suivre le maître ouvrier dans sa tâche. Brouillons, notes, et manuscrits sous les yeux, il a relevé tout effort du poète vers le mot juste et la forme impeccable. Les fervents de la langue, expression des nuances de l'esprit, lui en savent le plus grand gré. L'ordre des pièces selon les six éditions (1852-72) n'est pas moins lumineux. L'autre recueil distinct, *España*, a maintenant aussi son édition critique due à M. R. Jasinski (Paris: Vuibert, 1929). M. Jasinski ne s'est pas contenté de faire des excursions à Chantilly pour consulter les manuscrits et le *Cahier de voyage*. Ce carnet et *Tra los montes* à la main, il s'est vaillamment lancé sur les pas du prestigieux voyageur. Carte, vues superbes des lieux et monuments, photos d'œuvres d'art (30 illust.), en plus des originaux espagnols inspirateurs, tout ce dont le grand artiste s'est aidé figure dans cette belle et excellente publication. On visite le pays avec le poète, on pénètre dans son art grâce au rameau d'or qu'est le calame d'un agréable Aristarque, aussi à l'aise dans les jugements

littéraires qu'habile dans la critique des textes. C'est un véritable régal d'art et d'érudition. Le service que M. Jasinski a rendu aux poésies d'*España*, il l'étend aujourd'hui à tout le reste (*Poésies complètes de Théophile Gautier* [3 vols.; Paris: Firmin-Didot, 1932]). Si quelques pièces incluses dans les éditions M. Dreyfous (Paris: Charpentier, 1875-76) et Lemerre, dont les tomes I et II reproduisent exactement les deux volumes de Dreyfous, ont été sagement écartées, puisque leur bonne place est dans les œuvres qui les encadrent, d'autres ont été ajoutées, certaines déjà connues grâce à Bergerat et Lovenjoul, plusieurs inédites et dues aux recherches de M. Jasinski. C'est, en particulier, dans les pièces réunies par Dreyfous sous la rubrique de *Poésies nouvelles, inédites et posthumes* (1831-72), ou placées dans l'appendice, que le choix et l'ordre s'imposaient. Dorénavant, ces morceaux se présentent, croyons-nous, dans un classement que l'auteur n'aurait pas désavoué. Après un bref et précis examen des divers recueils et éditions, M. Jasinski s'arrête à chaque pièce. Chacune y reçoit les éclaircissements requis pour être pleinement comprise et appréciée. Ces notices sont concises, mais complètes. En 132 pages, on a tout l'indispensable sur les sources, les variantes, et les circonstances. Dans chaque cas, est indiquée la référence exacte à Lovenjoul. Cela évite le double emploi, mais d'autre part, prive bien des lecteurs de détails intéressants dont M. Jasinski n'aurait sans doute pas allégé son édition si l'éditeur lui avait un peu moins mesuré la place. Redisons-le, tout est là de fait ... ou indiqué, car, hélas! *l'Histoire des œuvres de Théophile Gautier* est rare et coûteuse. Bon papier, caractère sensé et lisible. Chaque tome est orné d'un portrait du poète à des âges différents.—HENRI DAVID.

The American Notebooks, by Nathaniel Hawthorne, based upon the original manuscripts in the Pierpont Morgan Library and edited by Randall Stewart (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1932; pp. xcvi+350), is an excellent piece of editing. It supplants the long-familiar *American Notebooks* published under Mrs. Hawthorne's editorship in 1868, the sole surviving value of this earlier publication now residing in the sixty-nine pages for 1835-40 for which there is no extant manuscript. It restores the original readings in an extraordinary number of passages and is accompanied by full and valuable notes. Mrs. Hawthorne's alteration and excisions of text were arbitrary and flagrant, but justified in the practice of her day and explainable on grounds of a wifely desire to present to the world her Victorian idealization of her husband. She refined upon his diction, she elevated or deleted all earthy or carnal events, descriptions, and allusions. Mr. Randall in restoring the text has restored the man.

But the new edition of the *Notebooks* is valuable beyond this point, for the editor has done a thorough piece of work in detailing the uses to which Hawthorne put them in his more formal works. It is familiarly and vaguely known that he turned to them for everything from plot to epithet; but Mr. Randall

has supplemented the obvious generalization with generous and exact detail. And in one particular he has revealed that Mrs. Hawthorne's inclination to refine on her husband's style was not very different from his own—that the novelist again and again substituted the polysyllabic and periphrastic for the simple and direct. If challenged for her tactics, Mrs. Hawthorne would doubtless have maintained that there was a fundamental distinction between a wifely editor and a scholarly editor—a point which comparison of the two texts amply confirms.

Mr. Randall might have done well to conclude his work with the section on "The Adaptation of Material from the American Notebooks in Hawthorne's Tales and Novels," for in the sections on "Development of Character Types" and "Recurrent Themes" in Hawthorne he makes an excursion over to a survey of the whole work of Hawthorne, which if treated at all should be treated with reference to all his notebooks, thus transcending the bounds of this editorial task. These latter sections may well be regarded as a generous redundancy that add no distinction to the main task, which is very well done in the restoration and annotation of the text and the two really relevant prefatory essays.—PERCY H. BOYNTON.

A series of essays reprinted from various sources discusses the influence of Ibsen on the Continent in fluent, picturesque style: about one-seventh of the space goes to Spain, a fourth to Italy, and the lion's share to France (Kurt K. T. Wais, *Henrik Ibsens Wirkung in Spanien, Frankreich, Italien*. Braunschweig: Westermann, 1933; pp. 83). The author finds a little transient influence in Spain, a powerful influence on Italian dramatists but a minimum on the theater-going public, a tardy reception in France (hostility from the older critics, cordiality from the younger), and for a time considerable influence on the French stage. The brochure abounds in enlightening quotations; e.g., a reactionary French critic, Leneveu, says of Nora in the *Doll's House* (p. 21): "... mais partir seule, sans tromper son mari, sans amant, donc sans excuse, rien que pour une idée, au nom de la dignité personnelle. C'était idiot! Et en effet, la dignité personnelle, qu'est-ce que cela?" Ibsen, we learn, compared himself to Zola in the following terms: "Zola stiger ned i kloakken for at bade sig, jeg for at rense den" (p. 46). In a note (p. 17) Wais lists material on Ibsen in France. Unfortunately the detailed Chicago dissertation by Carl Alvin Swanson, *Ibsen and the French Drama* (1930), escaped his notice; see *Abstracts of Theses, University of Chicago: Humanistic Series*, VIII (Chicago, 1929-30), 399-403.—C. N. GOULD.

A firm basis for the study of Conrad Ferdinand Meyer's manner of working is found in R. B. Roulston's new edition of *Huttens letzte Tage* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1933; pp. xviii+238). Of the ten variant editions Roulston prints in parallel four, the first, third, fifth, and tenth, and supplies the variants of the others. He gives, moreover, pertinent passages from

Meyer's correspondence. So far as the editions (five in number) at hand permit me to verify his work, it is painstakingly accurate. This edition of a great poem is a valuable contribution to our knowledge of Meyer. Let us hope that someone will soon undertake the critical and appreciative evaluation of *Huttens letzte Tage* on the basis of this edition.—A. T.

The resumption of the series "Les Littératures populaires de toutes les nations," of which the publication was interrupted thirty years ago, is an important event in folklore studies. It begins auspiciously with a collection of Roumanian tales and with Arnold van Gennep's *Le Folklore du Dauphiné*, Vol. I (Paris: Maisonneuve, 1932; pp. 311). This exhaustive account of customs and practices from the cradle to the grave and of festivals throughout the year is particularly notable for the maps which show the distribution of the variations in these folkloristic survivals. For the most part, comparative notes are lacking, although P. Sartori, *Sitte und Brauch* (Leipzig, 1910-14), and the *Handwörterbuch des deutschen Aberglaubens* (Berlin, 1927 ff.), would have supplied them.—A. T.

Additions to our scanty materials for the study of Chinese folklore are welcome. In his *Three Lectures on Chinese Folklore* (Peiping: North China Union Language School, 1932; pp. 164, one page (unnumbered) "Errata"), R. D. Jamieson gives some general ideas on Chinese myths with comment on the interpretation of folkloristic materials and then discusses the Cinderella, Fox Wife, and Persecuted Queen themes in the light of European parallels. The study has, therefore, two aims: an estimate of the value of folklore for the educated reader in China and an introduction for the student of folklore in other lands. Concerning its success in attaining the first purpose, it is hard for the reader in America to judge. It is evident that the limitations imposed by library resources have been considerable. Certainly it would have been better to separate new texts from the general consideration of folklore problems. We are very grateful for the half-dozen texts Jamieson gives, and look forward with keen interest to his promised *Index of Chinese Popular Narrative*.—A. T.

The study of children's games has not been prosecuted with the zeal their interest and importance might be expected to awaken. In a recent study (*The Game of Rich and Poor*, "FF Communications," C [Helsinki: Academia Scientiarum Fennica, 1931]; pp. 341) Elsa Enäjärvi-Haavio reviews the scholarly literature on children's games briefly and well as the preface to her chief concern, the history of a particular game. This game is played in Finland, the Baltic countries (except Lithuania), Scandinavia, Germany, and Belgium. Her careful study is the first application of the Finnish method to the investigation of children's games. It is comparable in length and importance to

Feilberg's excellent study of "London Bridge Is Falling Down" ("Bro Brille Legen," *Svenska Landsmål* [1905], Bilaga XII, No. 4). She remarks that the Finnish method is, after all, essentially the same as Lady Gomme's. The remark interests me since I contended some years ago that the Finnish method is no more than the codification of a procedure already implicit in the head-notes to Grundtvig's or Child's editions of ballads, a procedure which is little more than common sense (see "Precursors of the Finnish Method of Folklore Study," *Modern Philology*, XXV, 481-91). Mrs. Enäjärvi-Haavio's study contains, furthermore, a useful bibliography of children's games.—A. T.

le
e
-
d
l-
le
re
y